

409271923

VOLUME XXIII

NUMBER 3

July 1928

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

The Cambridge University Press, London The Maruzen Company, Limited, Tokyo
The Commercial Press, Limited, Shanghai

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON JENNINGS LAING
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Waggoner University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Fate University*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXIII

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1928

No. 3

Homer's Ithaca and the Adjacent Islands	By A. D. Fraser	213
La Catabasi Orfica	By Vittorio D. Macchiore	239
The <i>Kalendarium</i> Again	By Henry A. Sanders	250
Notes on Achaean Prosopography and Chronology	By Allen B. West	258
The Headings of Rescripts of the Severi in the Justinian Code	By C. E. Van Sickle	270
William Gardner Hale, 1849-1928		278
Notes and Discussions		280

Book Reviews

MARY C. NEEDHAM: The Aristotelian *Protreptics* and the Developmental Treatment of the Aristotelian Ethics.—MOSES HADAD: Sacred Chickens in Rabbinic Literature.—PAUL SHOREY: The Pathos and Humor of *as*.—H. C. NUTTING: Miscella.—CLYDE MURLEY: Cicero's Attitude toward Lucretius.—GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING: Corrigendum.

KERENITI: *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung, ein Versuch* (Hendrickson).—FRIEDLÄNDER: *Platon I. Eides. Paideia. Dialoge* (Shorey).—SAXL: *Vorläge der Bibliothek Warburg* (Shorey).—F. CALONGHI: *Albii Tibulli Altorumque Carminum Libri IV. LEVY: Tibullus* (Ullman).—ALLEN: *Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and Their Influence* (Flickinger).—LAMB: *Plato VIII. Charmides, Alcibiades I and II, Hipparchus, The Lovers, Meno, Theages, Epinomis* (Shorey).—FARLEY: *Les Formules et la métrologie d'Homère and L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Shorey).—CHAMBERS: *Cyclos of Taste* (Shorey).—BRYER: *Homer, Dickens and Sops. Dryden Hand. Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege* (Scott).—BRUNN: *Der fränkisch-mittelaltliche Eilertsmann Imberius und Margarete* (G. L. H.).—BARKHUS: *Fragmenta Postarum Latinerum Epicorum et Lyricorum propter Ennium et Lucilium* (Ullman).—HOHL: *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Ullman).—SIEMIENSKI: *Les Symboles Graphiques dans les Éditions Critiques de Textes. Proj. d'unification* (Ullman).—KLOTZ: *G. Julius Caesar Commentarii, Vol. III: Commentarii Belli Alexandrini, Belli Africi, Belli Hispaniensis, Fragmenta* (Ullman).—BÖLKE, EHRHARDT, ZIEHEN, LIEFOLD: *Sparta* (Shorey).—BRETT: *Psychology Ancient and Modern* (Shorey).—DRACHMANN: *Scholae Vetera in Pindari Carmina* (Shorey).—WILLIAMS: *Cicero, The Letters to His Friends, with an English Translation* (De Witt).—CHAPOT: *L'Évolution de L'Humanité: Le Monde Romain* (De Witt).—JAMES: *Our Hellenic Heritage* (Hellems).—HOUSEHOLD: *Hellas the Fore-runner* (Hellems).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, £1 1s 6d, each single copy, including postage, 3s 3d, each.
For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Woonan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.
Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this Journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1908, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1105, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

N

in

o. 3

213

239

250

258

270

278

280

292

ty of
year:
cuba,
tina,
ruay,
ows:
t for
.06).
oney

sub-
pica.
enia.
pub-
stock

or of

12.
ed on

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXIII

JULY 1928

Number 3

HOMER'S ITHACA AND THE ADJACENT ISLANDS

By A. D. FRASER

MORE than a hundred and twenty years ago, Sir William Gell made a heroic attempt to reconcile the description given in Homer's *Odyssey* of the island of Ithaca with the topographical features of Thiaki, or Ithaki, one of the smaller of the Ionian group, lying off the west coast of Greece.¹ His views, while assailed from time to time, held their own reasonably well throughout the nineteenth century. No serious alternative was suggested until twenty-five years ago, when Dr. Dörpfeld presented to the world a carefully reasoned brief wherein Ithaca was identified with the modern Leucas, or Leucadia, or Santa Maura, as it is variously named. Since that time, students of Homeric geography have been divided into rival camps; the resultant controversy tends to become exacerbated rather than assuaged as the years pass.²

In the *Odyssey*, four important islands, the Ithaca of the hero, Dulichium, Same (or Samos), and Zacynthus, are several times mentioned as it were in the same breath.³ The name of the first has quite

¹ Sir William Gell, *The Topography and Antiquities of Ithaca* (1807).

² Ithacan literature is most extensive. For a history of the earlier phase of the discussion, see Buchholz, *Die Homerischen Realien* (2 vols.; 1871). Later aspects of the controversy appear in W. Dörpfeld, *Mélanges Perrot* (1903), pp. 79-93; P. Goessler, *Leukas-Ithaka* (1904); Dörpfeld, *Leukas* (1905). A good summary is found in Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age* (1907), pp. 69 ff. Some of the most recent studies are: A. Shewan, *Class. Phil.*, XIX (1924), 140 ff.; *ibid.*, pp. 298 ff.; *ibid.*, XXI (1926), 193 ff.; *Antiquity*, I (1927), 402 ff.; F. Brewster, *Harvard Studies*, XXXI (1920), 125 ff.; *ibid.*, XXXIII (1922), 65 ff.; *ibid.*, XXXVI (1925), 43 ff.; *Class. Phil.*, XXII (1927), 378 ff.; Dörpfeld, *Alt-Ithaka, Ein Beitrag zur Homer-Frage* (2 vols.; 1927); Sir Rennell Rodd, *Homer's Ithaca* (1927).

³ *Od.* i. 246; ix. 24; xvi. 123; xix. 131. References to the *Odyssey* will be made throughout merely by number of book and line.

naturally fired the imagination of all; the identification of the other three is of decidedly minor importance. Yet the topographical relation of one to the other of at least three of them seems to be indicated in such a way that the scholar who attempts to lay his finger on Ithaca cannot well shun the attempt to identify all four. In accordance with the traditional view, Ithaca is the modern Thiaki; Same is Cephallenia (or Cephalonia); Dulichium is possibly Leucas; Zacynthus is Zante. Dörpfeld and his followers, on the other hand, make Ithaca Leucas, Dulichium Cephallenia, Same Thiaki, and Zacynthus Zante. The identification of the last island thus meets with general acceptance. Mr. Brewster, however, regards Same as Leucas.¹ The placing of Dulichium has presented an exceedingly knotty problem. Sir Rennell Rodd has recently revived a very old theory wherein it is identified with the quite insignificant island of Petala.²

A great diversity of opinion prevails concerning the matter of Homer's personal acquaintance with these western isles. Some credit him with an intimate knowledge of them;³ others feel that he must surely have tarried a time,⁴ or at least enjoyed a cruise, among them. There is also the school that favors the view that Homer's knowledge was gained from the accounts of sailors, or from a Phoenician *Periplus*⁵ that had somehow come into his hands. A few have ventured to assert that Ithaca is a purely imaginary island.⁶

Whatever the truth of this may be, all who have taken a hand in the controversy have been ready to acknowledge, at one time or another, that strict scientific accuracy is not to be expected in a poem, least of all in one where imagination plays so pronounced a part as in the *Odyssey*. As Professor Shewan has neatly expressed it:

Are we to expect from an old epic poet the accuracy required of a surveyor or geographer? Caesar knew Britain, but his account of it is defective. Mure, the historian of Greek literature, has asked in this connexion if we are to deny to Scott acquaintance with Scotland "because of an equal difficulty in identi-

¹ F. Brewster, *op. cit.*, XXXVI (1925), 43 ff.

² Sir Rennell Rodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 ff.; cf. D. T. Ansted, *The Ionian Islands* (1863), p. 239.

³ As Sir William Gell, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁴ As Sir R. Rodd, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁵ As Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odysée*, I (1902-3), 486 f.

⁶ As A. Herrmann, *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin* (1926).

fying the bay of Ellangowan or the castle of Tillietudlem," and Goethe's reply to those who haggled over the scene of the action of his *Hermann und Dorothea* is familiar.¹

But the old poet, none the less, exercises a charm that is not readily broken; and it is noteworthy that those whose voices are most loudly raised to proclaim his relative unreliability in topographical matters have been usually the most determined in their efforts to make his all-too-meager description of rock or islet fit the feature which supports the theory to which they have committed themselves. Of a truth, the *Odyssey* is altogether—if such an expression be permissible—"Ithaca-centric"; and even when the action of the poem is far away, the rugged isle is ever before the poet's view. However intently we may listen to the cold tones of scientific reason, our own hearts seem to tell us that, when we turn to the song of Homer, we give ear to one who has lived among the scenes he so vividly portrays.

I have for some time felt that the moment is opportune for a reconsideration of the whole question of the geography of the islands. It cannot, of course, be maintained that this may be attempted in the light of any great accretion of knowledge in this field that has been laid before us. Historical research, exploration, and even archaeology can afford us little help in our quest, despite the extraordinary advances made in these sciences during the present generation. It is not on the basis of minute considerations that the question can ever be decided. But I feel that the attention of scholars has been so completely riveted on the two diametrically opposed views of the traditionalists and the Dörpfeldians that they have come to consider the matter purely as a dilemma—if one theory be disproved, the other must needs be true. They thus fail to recognize the possibility that both may be quite wrong. If this possibility exists, it would appear that the only rational course to follow in the pursuit of truth would lie in the direction of a re-examination of the evidence which the Homeric poems provide. My own acquaintance with the Ionian Islands is limited to observations made during a cruise among them; but it is doubtful whether, in a quest of this sort, a minute topographical knowledge is essential to the investigator.

¹ A. Shewan, *Antiquity*, I (1927), 409.

In this essay, no attempt will be made to refute the arguments which have been adduced in support of their views by either party of the disputants. Destructive criticism has repeatedly worked its will on both. On the strength of the picture painted by Homer of the far-seen island, Thiaki would never have been so much as suggested as the home of Odysseus, had not a perverse tradition cast its spell over the minds of Gell and Schliemann, whose authority could not be lightly disregarded. As compared with its neighbors, Thiaki is but a trifling islet. Had it been Ithaca, its extraordinary configuration—two islands connected by a narrow isthmus—could hardly have escaped notice in the Homeric account. Dörpfeld stands on firmer ground in his *Leucas-Ithaca* theory, though Bérard has found in it but a single strong argument,¹ that wherein he identifies the islet Arkudi to the south of Leucas with the Asteris of the Telemachan episode. But, as will be presently shown, there is another island in the vicinity which agrees with Homer's account of Asteris very much better than does Arkudi. The several times repeated observation in the *Odyssey*, "for I do not suppose that you came here on foot,"² on which Dörpfeld thinks to base a strong argument for the Leucas-Ithaca theory, is so palpably a bit of Homeric jesting that unquenchable laughter must even now be arising from the heights of Olympus at the thought of a mortal's having taken it seriously. Moreover, in the eyes of both parties, *minutiae* have loomed altogether too large, while the main and distinguishing features of Homer's description have been somewhat egregiously neglected. A combination of such physical features as Cyclopean remains, two mountain-peaks, three harbors, a couple of fountains, and a stalactite cave, it is not difficult to find on almost any one of the Greek islands. Mild inquiries have even been made, it appears, regarding what has become of the olive stump out of which the bed of the hero was fashioned!

Throughout this study, it will be assumed that the entire *Odyssey* is the work of Homer, and the *Iliad* with the exception of the "Catalogue of Ships." This last is now almost universally rejected. Furthermore, the postulate will be maintained that Homer possessed a more or less detailed knowledge of the geography of the western islands, as well as of the topography of Ithaca. It matters little for our purpose

¹ Bérard, *op. cit.*, II, 483.

² i. 173; xiv. 190; xvi. 59, 224.

whether his information was gained through personal experience, hearsay, or a *Periplus*. I also hold the view that, in the identification of the several islands, the voice of tradition is wholly useless as a mentor, largely on account of the extraordinary upheavals of settlement that attended the coming of the Dorians. On Cephallenia one meets with the local names Samos and Douliche. On the assumption that these are ancient survivals, the former is eagerly seized upon by the supporters of the Cephallenia-Same, and the latter by the exponents of the Cephallenia-Dulichium, theory. As it happens, there is also a Leuke in Thiaki; and similar instances might be found elsewhere among the Ionian group. But it is quite to be expected that we should find terms expressive of the nature of physical features on a large scale applied likewise to the most trifling details of local topography. Long Island, which lies off the New York coast, may very possibly at some future date experience a change of name; but several dozens of Long Islands will still be found in the coastal and lacustrine waters of the country.

We must proceed, then, to make our attempts at identification on the basis of the broad general descriptions of the islands supplied by the poet, and on the strength of the light which certain episodes recounted by Homer throw on geographical positions. Owing to the need for expert knowledge of oceanography in such questions as the possible subsidence or elevation of the land in the Mediterranean, they will be left severely alone. Such features too as climate, rainfall, and forestation, which have undoubtedly become changed in the course of three millennia, will be passed by without notice. The identification of particular springs, rocks, and caves is of little moment, as we can find them, as a rule, wherever we will.

On the other hand, special attention will be given to the occurrence or recurrence of particularly descriptive terms which appear to be specifically employed by the poet. *Εἰσοίφυλλος* is a stock name which may be applied to any mountain not altogether barren. But if we find Homer using a descriptive epithet of one mountain alone, the point is surely one to be pressed. Again, such a name as "of Phorcys" seems to mean nothing in particular as attached to a harbor, but the force of "Rheithron" is immediately apparent. No attempt will be made, however, to engage in fine-drawn discussions regarding the

precise meanings of words. In every case, the most natural or the most generally accepted interpretation of the word will be adopted.¹

We gather from the *Odyssey* that there lie off the west coast of Greece, not very far from Elis, four islands, Ithaca, Dulichium, Same, and Zacynthus,² which are of particular importance. While metrical requirements may have something to do with the fact that they are invariably mentioned in this order, it may also be a fair supposition that they are here ranked in a descending scale of importance as regards area, fertility, or numbers of population. All other islands in the vicinity are presumably regarded by the poet as of slight importance. Now, of the Ionian group which occupies this region, there are four, Cephallenia, Corfu, Leucas, and Zante, which are somewhat of a size, the ratio between their areas being approximately 29:28:13:15, respectively.³ The remaining three, Paxos, Thiaki, and Kythera—as well as the other numerous islands of the neighborhood—are relatively of small extent. Even the famous Thiaki has only one-seventh the area of Cephallenia or Corfu. We may therefore reasonably conclude that it was the four major islands, and those alone, that Homer had in mind, and that even the notable Thiaki must needs be dropped from consideration for the present at least. It may be objected that Corfu is too remote from the rest, for Odysseus in the well-known passage of Book ix, wherein he describes his home, apparently designates the four islands as lying near to one another.⁴ But it must be observed that the distance from Corfu to Leucas is no greater than from Leucas to Zante. Corfu may be seen from Leucas and Cephallenia.⁵ So it is difficult to regard an island that is in sight of another as being other than “near” it.

So far as I am aware, no objection has ever been raised to the acceptance of the view that “wooded Zacynthus” is the modern Zante; consequently our problem is simplified to this extent. If then we are able to identify any two of the remaining islands of the group, the fourth will fall into place as a matter of course.

¹ Where the meaning of particular words is disputed, I have followed, in the main Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (1924).

² i. 246; ix. 24; xvi. 123; xix. 131.

³ The figures relating to the areas of the islands, as given by various authorities, vary to a surprising degree. I have here given the average of several estimates.

⁴ ix. 23.

⁵ Cf. Partsch, *Kephallenia und Ithaka* (1890), p. 16.

Same is but poorly portrayed for us by Homer. It is rough and uneven;¹ it is separated, we infer, by a strait of moderate width from Ithaca;² and it furnishes for the wooing of Penelope twenty-four suitors³ as compared with twenty from Zacynthus.⁴ The name *Same*, as it is suggested by Strabo and supported by modern scholarship,⁵ signifies "elevated"—rising high above its surroundings.

We are somewhat better off as regards Dulichium. It is spoken of several times in the *Odyssey* as "rich in wheat,"⁶ and it is also called "grassy."⁷ It is represented by fifty-two suitors,⁸ or more than the numbers combined of the wooers of Same and Zacynthus. In the "Catalogue of Ships," it is represented as supplying forty ships,⁹ including presumably a contingent from the Echinae Islands. Immediately afterward, we are told that the other three large islands, together with a section of the mainland, furnish but twelve. But the passage seems wholly unreliable. There is a general agreement among philologists in associating the word *Dulichium* with the adjective *δολιχός*, "long." The name must therefore be understood as "Long Island."

The evidence points directly at Corfu as being the island here designated by Homer. It is the most important island of the western group and decidedly the most prolific. During the early stage of Venetian occupation, it produced and exported a large amount of grain;¹⁰ but as this proved embarrassing to the Venetian nobles, who owned large estates elsewhere, the culture of the olive was forced on the inhabitants, and is today the chief industry. Corfu was capable, we may infer, of supporting, in antiquity as today, a large population. The island is extremely long and narrow, its southern tail being not more than three or four miles wide, and it bore in antiquity the name of *Sickle*, ἡ Δρεπάνη. The name "long" befits none other of the large islands in the slightest degree, as in each case the width is more than half the length.

The tradition that made Corfu the Scheria of the *Odyssey* has

¹ iv. 671, 845; xv. 29.

² *Ibid.*

³ xvi. 249.

⁴ xvi. 250.

⁵ Bérard, *op. cit.*, II, 411 f.

⁶ xiv. 335; xvi. 396; xix. 292.

⁷ xvi. 396.

⁸ xvi. 247.

⁹ II. ii. 625 ff.

¹⁰ John Davy, *Notes and Observations on the Ionian Islands and Malta*, I (1842), 32 n.

nothing whatever to support it, and is apparently based on the "Ship of Odysseus" rock which lies off the entrance to the Hyllaeon harbor. The Phaeacians are much too unreal, far too remote in every way from the Ithacans to have inhabited an island only a few hours' sail from them. Scheria belongs clearly to the region of dreams and shadows in the far west of the Mediterranean.

The apparently intimate association of Dulichium with the Echinaeae Islands which we have noted as indicated in the "Catalogue"¹ has occasioned endless worry to scholars. But the passage is quite worthless as regarded from the point of view of the topographer. The Echinaeae are spoken of as lying "beyond the sea" "facing Elis." They are, of course, neither beyond the sea nor do they face Elis. Meges, the leader of the men of Dulichium and the Echinaeae, is in the later account of the Greek forces declared to be a leader of the Epeians in Southern Greece.² The king of Dulichium, according to the *Odyssey*, is Acastus;³ but the possible changes occasioned by the passage of two decades must not be disregarded.

The Thesprotian episode,⁴ as the matter is ordinarily interpreted, presents a serious difficulty to the identification of Dulichium with Corfu. Odysseus, in the character of a Cretan adventurer, spins a yarn for the benefit of Eumaeus, recounting his exploits at sea. He has been shipwrecked, he declares, on the Thesprotian coast in Epirus. But he is befriended by the king of the country, Pheidon, who provides him with clothing and puts him on board a Thesprotian ship sailing to Dulichium, giving strict injunctions to the shipmen to conduct him safely to King Acastus. When the ship is well off shore, the men decide to make a gain of Odysseus by selling him into slavery. He is stripped of his fine clothing and clad in mean attire. In the evening the ship puts in at a secluded haven of Ithaca to enable the sailors to take supper in comfort before proceeding. Odysseus, however, escapes his bonds and, profiting by the darkness, hides in the bushes until his enemies have given up the search and once more set sail.

We may safely assume that so skilful a prevaricator as Odysseus constructs his numerous fabrications in such a way that there is no absurdity of detail. The story here may be accepted on its merits, as

¹ *Il.* ii. 625 ff.

² *Ibid.* xiii. 691, 692.

³ *xiv.* 336.

⁴ *xiv.* 334-57.

Eumaeus rejects only the part touching Odysseus. Apparently all scholars assume that the treacherous Thesprotians, after their betrayal of the hero, keep straight on toward Dulichium with the intention of selling him on that island. So indeed it no doubt appears on the face of it. But if a moment's reflection is given to the situation, it becomes clear that as shrewd a man as Odysseus would never for a moment have attempted to make Eumaeus believe anything so utterly absurd. If the shipmen had decided to court their own destruction, there would have been no better course open to them than to sell on a small island a man who had been sent to its king for protection under their care. The story is very poor in detail except where the hero himself is directly concerned; but what is surely meant is that the mariners ran away with Odysseus, ship and all, as soon as they were well out to sea, with the intention of selling him perhaps on the mainland of Southern Greece. Some very absurd suggestions have been made at times regarding the reason for the boat's touching at Ithaca. According to one view, the men must have gone out of their course for no other apparent reason than that of enjoying the scenery. But it is quite manifest that the true cause lies in the fact that they intend to make an all-night cruise of it,¹ as they well may as men fleeing from justice. It is quite impossible to believe that they would have put in at Ithaca at that hour of the day were their ultimate objective anywhere in the immediate neighborhood.

In a later part of the *Odyssey*, the hero tells the same story, in part, to Penelope.² But the queen does not listen once she hears that her husband is alive, so the account of the return is abruptly broken off.

There would be no strength in any objection that might be raised that it would have been absurd of Pheidon to profess to be helping the man on his way home by sending him to Corfu, which is, from the point of view of the Thesprotians, in quite the opposite direction. There is no hint given in the narrative that Crete is his destination. Rather does he make it clear in a later passage—where he wagers with Eumaeus—that Dulichium is the island that he has in view—"send me to Dulichium, where I desire to be."³

¹ On all-night sailings in Homer, see Seymour, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

² xix. 290 ff.

³ xiv. 396, 397.

Our general conclusion, then, is that the episode is altogether valueless in its ability to throw light on the location of Ithaca.

If the traditional interpretation of the affair be maintained, then, inasmuch as Dulichium is conceived of as more remote from Thesprotia than is Ithaca, and also in the same general direction, it would follow that the first island must be either Zante or Cephallenia. If it is the latter, then Ithaca must be Leucas; if Zante, Ithaca must be either Leucas or Cephallenia. But neither Zante nor Cephallenia agrees in the least with Homer's description of Dulichium, being neither long nor provided with broad meadows.

If Corfu is not the Homeric Dulichium, we are forced to accept the conclusion that the latter has, as some of the ancients maintained, disappeared beneath the sea,¹ or else Homer erred in calling it an island at all, and it must be found in the western peninsula of Cephallenia or in part of the mainland. These three would very obviously be counsels of utter despair.

Our information concerning Ithaca is more extensive and detailed than that regarding any one of the other islands. Much of this, however, applies to minor topographical points which are easily duplicated elsewhere, whatever the true island may be. We hear of the town and palace of the ruler, two or perhaps three fountains, a hill near the town, the quarters of the swineherd, the cliff Corax, and several harbors. These may for the present be disregarded, while we observe what is said about the island in general. The classic description occurs in a well-known passage of Book ix of the *Odyssey*.²

In the first line, Ithaca is distinguished by the adjective εὐδείελος. The same term is applied to Ithaca in five other passages of the *Odyssey*,³ but to no other island. The word has been variously interpreted as meaning "open to the afternoon sun," "on the western (or sheltered) side," "western," "distinguished," "bright," or "far-seen." Of these the last—"far-seen" or "conspicuous"—is the one most generally accepted.

The island contains a mountain, Neritus, which is designated by the usual appellative εἰνοσίφυλλος and also by ἀριπρεπής,⁴ "conspicu-

¹ Cf. Seymour, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

² li. 167; xiii. 212, 325; xiv. 344; xix. 132.

³ ix. 21-27.

⁴ ix. 22.

ous," a word which seems nowhere else in Homer to be applied to a mountain. The name Neritus itself is explained as meaning "incalculable," or "vast," "enormous."

Then comes the mention of the islands, Dulichium, Same, and Zacynthus, which lie near Ithaca. Lines 25 and 26 of the description have caused no end of trouble, wholly on account of the efforts of commentators to adapt the interpretation of them to the requirements of their own theses. Unless Homer is most flagrantly inconsistent, the word *χθαμαλή* can be taken only in the sense suggested by Strabo,¹ "near the land." *Πανυπερτάτη* might conceivably mean "highest" or "loftiest," but in view of the context is most rationally taken as meaning the island that appears "highest up from the point of view of one on the shore," i.e., farthest out to sea. *Πρὸς ζόφον* undoubtedly means "toward the west." It is futile to adduce statements of late writers and also the supposed views of "ancient geographers," who lived centuries after Homer, that the western coast of Greece actually ran east and west, and that *ζόφος* thus means "north." The Homeric Greeks, whatever their deficiencies may have been, certainly knew the place of the going down of the sun from the place of his rising; and here we have the exceedingly simple statement that the other islands lie more in the direction of the dawn, while Ithaca is situated toward the "gloom" into which the sun disappears at eve. The negative of the matter is well put in *Od.* x. 190 ff.: "We do not know the place of dusk or dawn, the place at which the beaming sun goes underground, nor where he rises." I should therefore translate the passage under consideration as follows: "Ithaca itself, though [comparatively] near the mainland, lies in the sea the most distant of all toward the west."

The rough character of the island is indicated in the *τρηχεῖ* of the next line (27). Elsewhere we read of its *ἡλιβατοι πέτραι*,² and once it is called *παιπαλοῦς*.³ This last is a general word for "ruggedness," as is shown by its application several times in Homer to roads.⁴ Four times in the *Odyssey* and once in the *Iliad*, we find the island designated by the word *κραναός*,⁵ which Homer uses of Ithaca alone. This appears to indicate a peculiarly elevated and mountainous nature.

¹ Strabo 454 C. ² xiii. 196. ³ xi. 480. ⁴ *Il.* xii. 168; xvi. 743; *Od.* xvi. 204.

⁵ i. 247; xv. 501; xvi. 124; xxi. 346; *Il.* iii. 201.

In the *Hymn to the Pythian Apollo*, we have also a reference to the "steep mountain of Ithaca"—presumably Neritus.

The description of his home which Telemachus gives to Menelaus tends particularly to emphasize the roughness of the island.² "I will not take your horses to Ithaca," he says, "for in Ithaca there are no open runs, no meadows . . . not one of the islands is a place for driving horses; none has good meadows, of all that rest upon the sea—Ithaca least of all." The islands here mentioned must be Same, Zacynthus, and the smaller ones, as Dulichium is excluded by virtue of the descriptions we have of it elsewhere.

The account of Ithaca given by Athena to the dazed Odysseus in Book xiii of the *Odyssey*³ agrees with this in the main, though there appear certain discrepancies. She enlarges on the fame of the island and adds: "Truly it is a rugged land and not fit for driving horses; and it is not so very poor, though not very wide. Grain grows abundantly and wine is produced. . . . There is good pasturage for goats and cattle, etc." The words which I have literally translated "not very wide" are also interpreted to mean "lacking meadows." In any case, the goddess is comparing Ithaca, not with the adjacent isles, but with the islands of the Mediterranean in general. But it is strange to find mention of abundant grain, the vine, and cattle-pasture in a region which, from its ruggedness, is lacking even in bridle-paths. Perhaps the *ἀθήσφατος* wheat is to be taken of quality rather than quantity. Or perhaps the astute goddess is merely attempting to jolly the depressed hero up a bit. She is herself by no means unskilled in the art of misrepresentation.

This is all of a distinctive nature that Homer has to say about Ithaca. Elsewhere in the *Odyssey* we find merely such conventionalities as "sea-girt"⁴ and "well-provided with buildings."⁵ The number of the suitors is recorded as twelve,⁶ though it is not altogether apparent why it is so small as compared with even Zacynthus's quota (twenty). It may be that personal respect for Penelope kept the number of Ithacans down; or else the strong hand of the Arceisian rulers had thinned out the ranks of the petty chiefs. There is likewise the possibility that the Ithacan woovers represent a smaller and more

¹ *Hymn to Pythian Apollo*, 428.

³ xiii. 242 ff.

⁵ xxii. 52.

² iv. 605 ff.

⁴ i. 386, 395, 401; ii. 293; xxi. 252. ⁶ xvi. 251.

aristocratic class than the others. They are referred to as πάντες ἄριστοι, while the men of the other islands are merely κοῦροι κεκριμένοι, φῶτες, and κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν.¹

We may now construct a sketch of the island by the aid of the dabs of color with which the poet has here and there supplied us. It lies the farthest off shore, and the most toward the west, of any of the four important western islands. It is extremely rocky and precipitous, possessing a mountain-peak, Neritus, which is gigantic in height and pre-eminent above all in the neighborhood. For this reason the island becomes conspicuous for a long distance on all sides.

This description clearly points to one island, and one alone—the modern Cephallenia. It lies farthest off shore, and from the point of view of the Greeks it was also the most westerly. It is true that Corfu is actually a little nearer the west, but its distance from Cephallenia is relatively so great, and the shore line of the mainland inclines so gradually to the northwest that its exact geographical or longitudinal position could not well be determined without the aid of scientific instruments. Cephallenia is far and away the most conspicuous island of the Ionian group, and its gigantic mountain, Aenos, which terminates in the peak Megalo Soros, or Monte Negro, towers fully a mile in the air, and can be seen eighty or ninety miles off. It stands more than twice as high as the relative mole-hills of Thiaki, and fifteen hundred feet higher than the loftiest summits of Leucas. The appearance of the island is thus described by Barrows: "The coast is rugged and abrupt. It is indeed a mountain rising from the sea. Seen from a distance, especially from the south, one might imagine it to be some vast sea-monster that had come to the surface to breathe, its arched back rising high in the air."²

Although, naturally enough, the suggestion has previously been made that Ithaca is Cephallenia, the question has not, as far as I am aware, been handled seriously and examined in detail.

The view that Ithaca and Cephallenia are one and the same is considerably strengthened through certain geographical requirements of the Phoenician episode,³ whose importance is generally disregarded

¹ xvi. 247-50.

² S. J. Barrows, *Isles and Shrines of Greece* (1890), p. 45.

³ xiii. 256 ff.

by topographers. The ready-tongued Odysseus, found by Athena on Ithaca where he has been left by the Phaeacians, invents a story to account for his presence there. Having committed, as he says, a murder in the island of Crete, he flees on a Phoenician ship, expecting to be set ashore at Pylos or in Elis. But as the shipmen are making their way up the west coast of Greece, a strong wind carries them off their course, and it is with great difficulty that they make the port of Phorcys, which appears to have been on a comparatively unfrequented part of the coast of Ithaca. Now, as any seafaring man would at once know, the only wind that could have carried a ship away from the coast of Elis and swept it toward the islands must have been an off-shore one, blowing out of the east. This would naturally have carried the boat in the general direction of Zante or Cephallenia. The more northerly islands would be out of the question. Since Zante cannot well be Ithaca, it follows that the ship was borne to Cephallenia—presumably to a southern port. And a vessel that had weathered Cape Liaki, the most southerly extremity of the island, would find it possible, and no more, to squeeze into the bay of Livadi that lies just beyond it.

We have thus identified Zacynthus with Zante, Dulichium with Corfu, and Ithaca with Cephallenia. It would seem, then, that Same is Leucas. That the last has always been regarded as an island, in spite of its bordering on the peninsular form, is reasonably certain. Even if the channel between it and the mainland sometimes becomes silted up, a simple-minded and non-scientific people like the Homeric Greeks would not have caviled over the name. Even the Peloponnesus is styled an "island." The identification of Same with Leucas has recently been strongly supported by Brewster.¹ The meager Homeric description that we have indeed fits it very well. It lies at no great distance from Cephallenia-Ithaca. It is rugged, and the non-specialized word *παπαλδεις* which Homer always uses to designate the general character of Same is very applicable to Leucas—as it would also be to Zante or Thiaki, but not to the comparatively low-lying Corfu or the exceedingly elevated Cephallenia. The *κραναός* which marks Ithaca apparently indicates a much more precipitous appearance. The name *Same*, which must mean "elevated," is particularly applicable

¹ F. Brewster, *op. cit.*, XXXVI (1925), 43 ff.

to Leucas, which is described by Baedeker as "almost completely occupied by a mountain chain," whose several peaks average about thirty-four hundred feet in height. The island, taken as a whole, may thus be described as the most "generally elevated" of the Ionian group.

Any theory of Ithaca's location seems bound to sink or swim on the strength of its ability to account for the details of the Telemachan episode. When the return of Telemachus from Pylos is expected by the suitors,¹ the brutal Antinous takes twenty companions and sails out to the island Asteris where they lie in ambush with the intention of slaying the prince. The island and its position are thus described: "There is a certain rocky island in mid-sea, halfway between Ithaca and rugged Same, Asteris, an island of no great size. It has twofold harbors safe for ships; and here the Achaeans awaited him, lying in ambush."² Elsewhere the suitors are spoken of as lying in wait "in the strait between Ithaca and rugged Same."³ On their return, when their victim has eluded them, they tell how by day their scouts kept watch on the wind-swept heights, and when night fell they cruised up and down on the sea watching for the ship of Telemachus.⁴

This island Asteris is identified by the traditionalists perforce in the rock Daskalio which lies between Thiaki and Cephallenia. But it corresponds in no way with Homer's description except in being rocky. It rises but ten feet above the water and has no haven of any sort. It is also in an impossible place, as it is clearly the intention of the suitors to waylay and murder Telemachus somewhere away from Ithaca. Whether from fear or out of consideration for Penelope, they hesitate to commit the outrage publicly. Otherwise the youth had perished on Ithacan soil.

Dörpfeld is more fortunate, owing to his choice of Leucas as Ithaca, in finding a reasonably good Asteris in the islet Arkudi, which lies between Leucas and Thiaki. It possesses on the eastern side two coves which seem to answer to the curious name ἀμφίδυμος. There is also a hill on it, a few hundred feet in height, from which observations might have been made.

Brewster, a staunch traditionalist as far as Ithaca is concerned,

¹ iv. 663 ff.

² iv. 671; xv. 29.

³ iv. 844 ff.

⁴ xvi. 365 ff.

accepts the view that Asteris is Arkudi,¹ on the assumption that the suitors expected Telemachus to double the northern end of Thiaki-Ithaca on his way to Polis, which appears the most likely site in the island for the ancient capital. But this theory, though defended with much ingenuity by its proponent, is entirely unconvincing.

Our view that Cephallenia is Ithaca and Leucas Same derives an extraordinary support through the details of this episode. Asteris can be none other than Thiaki.² The island is very rocky, and is of no great size, having but one-seventh the area of Cephallenia. There is, of course, no occasion for reading the words *οὐ μεγάλη*,³ wherein Homer specifies its size, as "tiny," as there is no suggestion of litotes here. The word *Asteris* apparently means "Star Island," and is so translated by Palmer and others. I have never viewed Thiaki from the highlands of Cephallenia, but to judge from its outlines, it might well present the appearance, from this angle, of two stars joined together. As to the word *πορθμός*, of which much has been made, I am wholly ignorant as to the minimum width that a sheet of water must possess to be accounted worthy of bearing the name. At any rate, the breadth of the strait between Cape Ducato in Leucas and Cape Daphnoudi in Cephallenia is less than ten miles, and the northern end of Thiaki lies but four or five miles to the east of a line drawn between these two points. It seems to be of small account whether or not we strain the word *μεσσηγύς*⁴ to signify precisely the midmost point in the strait. But it is noteworthy that, from the point of view of the bay of Samos, which was, I believe, the site of the ancient capital and was thus the central point of the whole story, Thiaki lies exactly halfway between it and Leucas. We must remember that the Greeks had to use their eyes alone in such computations, and if one looks from Samos directly north toward Leucas, he sees as much open water between him and the nearest point in Thiaki in that direction as from the far side of Thiaki across to Leucas.

What the word *ἀμφίδυμος*⁵ meant to Homer it is very difficult to divine. Its simple meaning is "double" or "twofold," and it occurs

¹ Brewster, *op. cit.*, XXXVI (1925), 43 ff.

² It appears from a passage in Strabo, quoted from Apollodorus, that even in historical times the name Asteris stuck to Thiaki. See Rodd, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

³ iv. 846.

⁴ iv. 845.

⁵ iv. 846.

here alone in the poems. It is sometimes taken to signify "with double entrance"—which naturally would involve a harbor with an island lying off its mouth. Or it perhaps means "twin," in the sense of two havens side by side, as is found at Arkudi. I suggest that it may very likely mean "double," as having two compartments, like the figure 8. Now, as it happens, the harbor of Vathy, on the east side of Thiaki, is of much this form. It opens off the Gulf of Molo, and one entering it finds himself at first within a triangle pointing into the land, and with open apex. Passing through this apex, he enters the inner harbor which is elliptical in form. This is surely a "twofold" haven. Those who favor the "double entrance" view will also observe a small island lying in the middle of the entrance to the outer harbor. If the "twin" interpretation be insisted on, we need but transfer ourselves a few miles toward the east on the gulf, where we find the harbor of Skinos or Schinos. It is thus described by Sir Rennell Rodd: "It is protected by headlands, and at the head of the bay in the centre a tongue of rock divides it into two harbors, both of which have a shelving beach on which a vessel might be beached without a shock."¹ All the possible interpretations of ἀμφίδυμος are thus nicely met in the ports of the island. Adjacent to both Vathy and Skinos there are "windy headlands," particularly Mount Stephano, from which an outlook could be maintained.

A more ideal set of conditions to meet the purpose of the suitors could not well be imagined. Their intention in sailing away from the city was, as we have seen, that the fell deed might be done in secret. At the same time, they must have a safe anchorage, a lookout point, and an island not too well inhabited. In Skinos or Vathy they had an excellent port, and within a few miles at most were found high summits from which the news of the approach of the ship of Telemachus could be signaled to the shore. Although remains of pre-Dorian settlements have been discovered some distance back from the coast in southern Thiaki, neither Vathy nor Skinos appears to have been inhabited in early times.

The incidents which are related in the return of Telemachus are impossible of rational explanation on the basis of the Leucas-Ithaca or the Thiaki-Ithaca theories; but they become simplicity itself if we

¹ Rodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 151 f.

assume that the ultimate objective of Telemachus—the town—was situated on the bay of Samos. The youth is warned by Athena¹ that the suitors lie in wait in some unspecified place between Ithaca and Same. He is therefore to “keep away from the islands.” This clearly means Thiaki or any other island between the two; there is no use in Athena being explicit, for she knows that the suitors are cruising hither and thither at night, and she advises him to sail both night and day. We infer that he is directed to sail straight toward Ithaca; for he is told that when he reaches the nearest point on the shore of the island, he is to disembark and proceed on foot to the hut of Eumaeus, while the ship goes on without him.

The overland journey and the early part of the voyage home are uneventful. He reaches northern Elis considerably after sunset;² then he directed his ship, we are told, toward the islands (called *θοῖαι*), pondering whether he were destined to escape death or be taken.³ From this point in the cruise we have no word of him until he reaches southern Ithaca. The epithet *θοαί*, as applied to islands, is very perplexing. It has been variously explained as “vanishing” or “fading in the night,” “swiftly flying by”—a purely subjective idea, “with sharply projecting headlands,” and “with sharp mountain peaks.” To fit the regular theories, scholars⁴ have sent Telemachus off to the north toward the Echinae, one of which bears the name *Oxya*, “sharp.” But it is impossible to understand the necessity for such a detour. For our purposes, believing as we do that Telemachus was devout enough to obey implicitly the injunctions of Athena, no such extraordinary deviation need be postulated. Nor does it greatly matter which of the four interpretations cited we adopt as the true meaning of *θοαί*, which is here a thoroughly poetic word. The first two, “vanishing” and “swiftly flying,” are applicable, under the required conditions, to all islands. Furthermore, as we understand the situation, Telemachus, upon reaching Cape Trepito in Elis, heads directly for the nearest shore of Cephallenia-Ithaca. This would be the long projecting headland, Hagios Athanasios. It is very interesting also to observe that it is precisely from the direction of Cape Trepito that the huge Monte Negro appears to one as pointed, the range having the form of a knife-

¹ xv. 26 ff.

² xv. 299, 300.

³ xv. 298.

⁴ As Rodd, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

blade on edge, with the point aiming to the southeast. Had Telemachus begun here to deviate from a straight course, disobeying the orders of Athena, it would have been unnecessary for him to fall immediately into a state of anxiety concerning his chances of escape or capture.

Some time later, presumably at early dawn, the ship makes Ithaca,¹ where all disembark and, after a meal is eaten, Telemachus walks up the hills to the hut of the swineherd, while the vessel proceeds on its way to the harbor.² That the port is a considerable distance away is shown by the fact that the sailors take the trouble to make a landing for the purpose of taking breakfast. The distance from the cape Hagios Athanasios to the interior of the bay of Samos is about twenty miles. The overland route to the most probable location of the hut of Eumaeus would not measure much more than half that distance. So Telemachus has time to chat for a brief space with the old man and then send him to the palace, near which he meets another messenger from the ship of Telemachus that has just landed.³ The ship is followed into port almost immediately by the suitors' ship.⁴ The first words of Antinoüs, the leader of the party, make it clear that they have recognized that Telemachus was not in the ship, and that their ambushade had thus proved fruitless.⁵

Mr. Brewster, in a recent study of the situation, has reached the very extraordinary conclusion that "you simply cannot tell one boat from another at even less than a mile."⁶ Quite possibly Mr. Brewster or I could not, but with the practiced eye of seafaring men the case would be altogether different. I recall how, as a boy, I used to sit on the seashore in company with a pair of old sailors watching the racing of small craft. A dozen or more yachts, smaller than the Homeric ship, for they could not possibly hold twenty men each, took part in the contests. At a distance of two or three miles, with the sun off shore, and in a murky atmosphere, these old salts could readily distinguish not only one vessel from another, but all the fine points of seamanship manifested in the steering and the manipulation of the sails. We must also remember that the aged Eumaeus was able to

¹ xv. 495 ff.

² xv. 547 ff.

³ xvi. 322.

⁴ xvi. 351.

⁵ xvi. 364 ff.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, XXXVI (1925), 59.

distinguish the men and even the shields and spears in the ship of the suitors,¹ as he viewed it from the Hill of Hermes, which stood "above," that is, further inland than, the town itself. In the clear Mediterranean air, a sailor of keen vision could undoubtedly distinguish a boat with which he was familiar a dozen miles away. Then, when the signal should be given from the hills of Thiaki, a boat from Vathy or Skinós would have ample time to sail round the southern end of the island and intercept any craft coming from the south. The direction toward which their watch was maintained was also all in their favor; *they never had to contend with the sun in their eyes.*

We may next inquire whether the various features of the Mentean episode² are in any way to be reconciled with the topography of Cephallenia. Athena lands on Ithaca in the guise of the Taphian Mentés, who is carrying a cargo of iron to Temese, to be exchanged for copper. With the identification of Taphus and Temese we are in no way concerned. The arguments by which their identification has been supported in the past regularly constitute a *petitio principii*. It is idle, also, to speculate on the question of what island was richest in iron and what in copper at that date. Be that as it may, the supposed Mentés says this much about Ithaca: "My ship lies here [he points in a certain direction], off the land, at a distance from the city, in the bay of Rheithron under wooded Neion."³ In another passage of the *Odyssey*, Ithaca is spoken of as *ὑπονήλιος*,⁴ "at the foot of Neion." This, naturally, must refer to the city, not the island. It would thus appear that both the port of Rheithron and the ancient town lay under the mountain.

Mention has already been made of the Aenos range of southern Cephallenia, with its lofty peak, Monte Negro, or Megalo Soros, which we have identified with the Homeric Neritus. Parallel with it toward the northeast is the shorter and lower range of the Atros which extends for nearly a dozen miles and has three main peaks, one of which, Kokkini Rachli, attains to a height of thirty-seven hundred feet. We have tentatively placed the city near the bay of Samos which lies at the foot of this mountain toward the north. At the southeastern extremity of the range, the stream Arakli (or Rakli) pours down a ravine into a little bay known by the name of Poros. The river is indeed the

¹ xvi. 471 ff.² i. 102 ff.³ i. 185, 186.⁴ iii. 81.

only one of considerable size now found in the island. Now *Rheithron*, the name of the port where the ship of Mentis lay, signifies, of course, the "Flowing" or "Running Harbor." A more appropriate title for Poros could hardly be conceived, as it is formed by a little headland and the mouth of the Arakli. If it should, perchance, be felt that the distance from Samos is too great, we have also the port of Antisamos, round the promontory to the east, to fall back upon. It also lies under the mountain, and a stream of some size flows into it from the west.

The harbor of Phorcys¹ and the prospect therefrom² are somewhat intimately described in two passages in Book xiii of the *Odyssey*. From the second, we learn that Neritus is in plain view; but as Aenos is in sight of almost every part of the Cephallenian coast, this mention of the mountain is not particularly significant. In the other passage, the harbor is said to have in it two abrupt, projecting headlands, λιμένος ποτιπεπτηνῖαι.³ These last words have occasioned some difficulty; their general sense is "inclining inward" or "tending toward"—ἔσω νενεκῶναι, as the scholiast explains them. We may follow Palmer's rendering: "Here two projecting, jagged cliffs slope inward toward the harbor, and break the heavy seas caused by wild winds without." But this is regularly understood by authorities after the fashion in which the passage is explained by Merry: "Two extremities of the headlands narrow the harbor's mouth."⁴ He compares *Od.* x. 89, where this is apparently the meaning, but the words are quite different. However, the words of Homer in the passage we are discussing surely imply, not that the headlands formed a part of the shore of the harbor, but rather are completely within the port, ἐν λιμένι. Any other meaning that may be attached to it is dragged perforce from the simple statement.

Our previous postulate that the land of the Phaeacians lay in the distant west suggests the probability that the port to which Odysseus was conducted was situated on the western side of Cephallenia. In the bay of Livadi, as it happens, we find a situation which is almost, if not altogether, unique in its fulfilment of the requirements of Homer's description. The bay is six or seven miles in length, and on its eastern side, well within the haven itself, a sizable peninsula, on which the modern Argostoli stands, juts out sharply into the harbor

¹ xiii. 96 ff.

³ xiii. 98.

² xiii. 345 ff.

⁴ See Merry's *Odyssey* (1892), *ad. loc.*

and terminates in two projecting headlands which point, as it were, into the very heart of the haven.

That this is the harbor of Phorcys seems also very probable in the light of certain details of the fictitious account of himself which Odysseus gives to his discoverer Athena.¹ This episode we have already discussed in connection with the identification of Ithaca. The violent wind that carries the Phoenician ship away from the coast of Elis would presumably sweep her along the southern shore of Cephallenia. By means of a desperate effort the crew just make the harbor of Phorcys, where they leave the exhausted Odysseus. If it is granted that our main premises are sound, it is clear that had they missed this port they would have been carried out into the wide Ionian sea. But it would be just possible for a tempest-tossed craft, after turning Cape Liaki on the south of Cephallenia, to squeeze into the bay of Livadi.

A further description of the haven is provided by the poet. After speaking of the two headlands, he notes the tranquillity of the waters behind them, where ships do not require even to be moored. No description could better suit the conditions of Kutavos, the harbor of Argostoli behind the headlands, actually a haven within a haven. At the head of the harbor there is, according to the Homeric description, a large olive-tree and near it a peculiar kind of cave. Like many others, it possesses stalactites and stalagmites; but it also has perpetually flowing water within it, and two entrances—one to the north for men, one to the south for the immortals.

One is naturally skeptical regarding the identification of particular caves in a region where they are so abundantly found. But certainly the description of this cave marks it as being of a phenomenal sort. If the expression, *ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος*,² "at the harbor's head," indicates precisely the innermost point in the harbor in question, there seems nothing here which may correspond; although, according to Partsch,³ several springs of water are to be found at the foot of the rocks near the inner extremity of Kutavos. But if the *ἐπὶ κρατὸς* may conceivably mean something else, there is a suggestion that may be offered for what it is worth. One of the curiosities seen by the visitor to Argostoli is the famous pair of "sea-mills" which are situated to the north of the town, just within the promontories that we have described. The

¹ xiii. 256 ff.

² xiii. 102.

³ Partsch, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

"mills" are operated by streams of sea-water which flow into caverns in the land and disappear underground. So far as I know, the phenomenon is unparalleled elsewhere. It is thus described by Barrows: "The water runs in from the sea, passes through a deep natural channel in the rock, and has sufficient fall to turn a large mill-wheel. To find just where the current from the sea goes has baffled investigators. It mysteriously disappears in the rocky caverns . . . and hides its course somewhere in the interior of the island."¹

While the mills have been constructed within the past hundred years, the caverns and the flow of water are presumably as old as the island itself.

It may be that this is what Homer had in mind. The "ever flowing water" which is mentioned in his description is curiously suggestive of the salt current. It is interesting to note that this is the only occurrence of the word *ἀεράων* in Homer. It is used in Hesiod in reference to rivers.² The opening where the water disappears would serve admirably as an entrance for chthonic or marine deities, and this portal would, from the nature of the case, be denied to men. As it also happens these entrances are almost north and south, just as Homer speaks of them being in his cave.

It is just possible that the presence of a huge tree on the shore is here associated in the mind of Homer with the sucking up of water by the earth, for the situation may be compared with that in Book xii,³ where Odysseus finds the fig-tree standing over the spot where Charybdis swallows down the water.

In *Od.* xiii. 345 ff., where Athena points out the several features of Ithaca that are in view, there seems to be a reference to two caves. Lines 347, 348 repeat lines 103, 104, and are said by Eustathius to be missing in several ancient manuscripts of the poem. They are commonly regarded as interpolated, on the ground that there is only one cave in the place. If, however, our identification of the spot where Odysseus landed be correct, it would seem quite possible that the text is genuine, and that the second cave is the other "sea-mill" which is not more than a quarter of a mile distant.

¹ Barrows, *op. cit.*, p. 46. For a fuller description, see Partsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 ff.; Ansted, *The Ionian Islands* (1863), pp. 322 ff.

² Hesiod *Works and Days* 550.

³ xii. 103, 431.

It is manifest from the Homeric account that the spot where the hero was laid to sleep was quite uninhabited. But settlements were at no great distance, as care is taken by the Phaeacians to place his belongings out of the way of any "wayfaring man"¹ who may happen along. There is no indication that the peninsula where Argostoli stands was inhabited in remote antiquity; but at a short distance to the southeast stood the town of Kranoi, where the presence of Mycenaean walls and tombs proclaims the existence of a pre-Dorian town of some importance.²

We have little knowledge concerning the city of Odysseus. It contains the palace of the ruler, and lies, as we have noted, at the foot of Mount Neion.³ "The town," says Seymour,⁴ "seems to lie near the harbor, for Telemachus, on leaving the Ithacan assembly [*Od.* ii. 260], goes to the shore before going to the palace. He washes his hands in the sea and prays to Athena, but nothing indicates that he went thither expressly to pray; he apparently is on his way home." This port is twice distinguished by the epithet *πολυβειθής*,⁵ which must mean either "deep" or "with many recesses," but from the use of the word elsewhere in Homer we are inclined to the belief that it is not in any way significant. A mound above the town is called the Hill of Hermes,⁶ though the scholiast may be right in explaining this as merely a heap of stones by the wayside. If we are to understand *κατά* in the usual way in the verbs *κατέρχομαι*, *κάτειμι*, and *κατάγω*,⁷ which are found in different parts of the narrative, we must infer that there is a descent as we approach the town from the quarters of Eumaeus and from the farm of Laërtes. There is nothing surprising in this.

This slight description tallies well with Samos, on the bay of the same name. I do not refer to the site of the modern village of Samos, but to the Acropolis (*Palaeokastro*) which rises to a height of 900 feet about three-quarters of a mile inland to the southeast. At a short distance on either side of it are the lower hills Kyatis and Alpovuni. On these sites Mycenaean walls and pottery have been found. The

¹ xiii. 123.

² See *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1911), pp. 7 f.

³ iii. 81.

⁶ xvi. 471.

⁴ Seymour, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁷ xi. 188; xv. 505; xx. 163.

⁵ xvi. 324, 352.

old scholar Ansted, who made a special study of the islands, speaks of Samos as "certainly one of the earliest and grandest of these ancient Greek cities enclosed by Cyclopean walls."¹

The various other topographical points of the island—the farm of Laërtes,² the rock Corax,³ the piggery of Eumaeus,⁴ the fount Arethusa,⁵ and one or two other springs⁶—do not call for particular notice, as such features are seldom far to seek. It is, however, worth while pointing out that it is unnecessary here, as with the traditional spots of Thiaki-Ithaca, to demand of the aged Eumaeus a ten-mile walk from his hut to the town. While the effort might have been quite within his powers, it is very unfair to ask him to drive so unruly an animal as a pig over this distance. Good land for the rearing of swine is found in the valley of Samos, a short distance to the southwest of Palaeokastro. This situation would be in full accord with what information we have of the visits paid to the swineherd's hut by Odysseus from the port of Phorceys and by Telemachus from the remote end of the island.

A word may be added regarding the tribal name Kephallenes, Cephallenians, which occurs several times in Homer. The people of the Cephallenians are referred to, but very indefinitely, once in Book xx⁷ and three times in Book xxiv⁸ of the *Odyssey*. Twice in the *Iliad*⁹ they are called the subjects of Odysseus, though it is quite possible that military and political command do not mean the same thing. In the "Catalogue," the Cephallenians are spoken of as the inhabitants of Ithaca, Same, Zacynthus, and a section of the mainland.¹⁰ The meager notices of them in the *Odyssey* would appear to mark them as dwellers in these islands and perhaps Dulichium as well. It is quite impossible to be sure whether we are to conceive of the sway of Odysseus as extending anywhere beyond his own island.¹¹ But it is at any rate interesting to find the tribal name surviving after the names Ithaca, Dulichium, Same, and Zacynthus had disappeared from their

¹ See Ansted, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

⁶ xvii. 205 ff.; xx. 154, 158.

² xxiv. 205 ff.

⁷ xx. 210.

³ xiii. 408.

⁸ xxiv. 355, 378, 429.

⁴ xiv. 5 ff.

⁹ *Il.* ii. 631; iv. 330.

⁵ xiii. 408.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* ii. 621-37.

¹¹ The passage xxi. 344 ff. is of very doubtful interpretation.

respective islands; and it is natural that this tribal name should fall to the lot of the island of Odysseus.

It is not difficult to account for the transference of the name Ithaca to the little neighboring island of Asteris during the Dark Ages of Greek history. I confess that I am unable to cite a certain parallel in the case of islands, but there are many instances where the old city-site is forgotten, while its name survives in some insignificant village near by. The identification of biblical sites presents a problem not unlike that involved with Homeric, and in Palestine we meet with numerous instances of the circumstances that have just been mentioned.¹

Our geographical conclusions may thus be summarized: Dulichium is Corfu; Same is Leucas; Ithaca is Cephallenia; Zacynthus is Zante; Asteris is Thiaki, whose "twofold" harbor or harbors open off the Gulf of Molo.

The main topographical features of Ithaca are as follows: The city was near the bay of Samos, under the mountain at whose southeastern extremity we find the harbor Rheithron in the bay of Poros. The harbor of Phoreys is the bay of Livadi, and Odysseus is set ashore by the Phaeacians in the inner harbor of Kutavos.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY

¹ Cf. R. A. S. Macalister, *A Century of Excavation in Palestine* (1925), pp. 80 ff.

LA CATABASI ORFICA

By VITTORIO D. MACCHIORO

I

IL RACCONTO più antico di una Katabasis, cioè di una discesa all'Hades, passa per essere quello dell'XI libro dell'Odissea, dove è narrata la cosiddetta Catabasi di Ulisse. Ma non si tratta punto di una Catabasi perchè Ulisse *non discende lui stesso* nell'Hades ma fa *salire* su dall'Hades le anime mediante un esorcismo.

Lo scopo per il quale egli compie questo esorcismo, seguendo le prescrizioni di Circe, è di consultare Tiresia intorno alla via del ritorno, e gli occorre Tiresia perchè questi, unico fra gli uomini, ha conservato dopo morto la sua intelligenza.¹

Circe dunque ordina a Ulisse di attraversar l'Oceano e di approdar dove è il bosco di Persefone: ivi egli deve scavare una fossa, fare ai morti una libagione di miele, vino e acqua, versarvi su farina e sacrificarvi sopra un ariete e una pecora nera volta verso l'Erebo; allora verranno su le anime avidi di bere il sangue della vittima, ma egli dovrà rattenerle con la spada fino a che Tiresia abbia bevuto il sangue e abbia parlato.

Si tratta di una operazione magica, la quale mediante il sangue costringe le anime a uscire dall'Hades dove esse sono chiuse per sempre dopo avvenuta la sepoltura:² solo Elpenore non beve il sangue e tuttavia parla con Ulisse perchè, non essendo stato sepolto, non è ancora definitivamente chiuso nell'Hades.

Il bere il sangue è necessario perchè il morto possa comunicare col vivo, al punto che Ulisse impedisce alla madre stessa di bere prima che Tiresia abbia bevuto e parlato:³ dopo Tiresia beve la madre, che riconosce il figliuolo e parla con lui, e dopo di lei accorrono le anime avidi di bere e Ulisse permette che bevano una alla volta e le interroga.

Ulisse durante l'esorcismo resta all'orlo della fossa e per ogni anima

¹ Od. x. 489 s., 563 s.

² Cfr. II. xxiii. 71 s.

³ xi. 88 s.

con la quale parla usa il verbo *venne*, mostrando così chiaramente che non egli discende all'Hades ma le anime salgono a lui.¹

Col. v. 233 il tono e il contenuto del racconto cambiano. Ulisse enumera ancora altre anime, ma dice *vidi* invece di *venne*,² e questa enumerazione si inizia con un *colà*³ che non si può riferire al luogo dove Ulisse si trova e che denota vagamente un *altro luogo*. Anche il contenuto e il tono di questa seconda enumerazione, che va dal verso 235 al v. 327, sono diversi: nessuna delle anime ora enumerate si mostra avida di bere il sangue nè lo beve, nessuna parla con Ulisse che non fa altro che descriverle, e il tono di Ulisse invece di continuare ad esser familiare accorato semplice, diventa enfatico ed epico, quasi che egli recitasse una serie di brevi elogi funebri, man mano che egli scorge le ombre: "vidi da prima Tiro nata di nobile padre, che disse esser figlia dell'esimio Salmoneo, vidi Antiope, figlia di Asopo, che si gloriava di aver dormito tra le braccia di Zeus ... vidi Alcmena che partorì Eracle audace, cuor di leone, accoppiatasi con Zeus ..." e via dicendo.

L'enumerazione è interrotta da Ulisse stesso che nota esser giunta l'ora del riposo, ma Alcino lo esorta a continuare. E col v. 335 riprende l'enumerazione delle anime vedute: ma si ritorna al tono primiero. Di nuovo Ulisse dice *venne*⁴ e di nuovo l'anima beve il sangue e dopo bevutolo riconosce Ulisse e gli parla; e l'anima di Agamennone è descritta in modo identico a quello di Anticlea,⁵ cioè debole e senza consistenza: ed anche Achille, che segue ad Agamennone, descrive nel medesimo modo le anime.

Ma finito il colloquio con Achille questi che pure era *venuto* da Ulisse, cioè salito su dall'Ade, si allontana *camminando a gran passi sul prato di asfodelo*.⁶ Egli non è dunque più un'ombra senza vita ma vigoroso e svelto; subito dopo Ulisse descrive altre anime che stanno

¹ xi. 51: Πρώτη δὲ ψυχὴ Ἑλπήνορος ἦλθεν; 84: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ μητρός; 90: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο; 152: ἐπὶ μήτηρ ἦλυθε; 225: ἦλυθον . . . ὄσσαι ἀριστῶν ἄλοχοι ἦσαν.

² V. 235: ἔθ' ἦτοι πρῶτην Τυρῶ ἴδον; 260 τὴν δὲ μετ' Ἀντιόπην ἴδον; 280: καὶ Χλωρίν εἶδον; 298: καὶ Ἀθήνην εἶδον; 305-6: τὴν δὲ μετ' Ἰφιμέδειαν . . . εἶσιδον; 321: Φαίδρην τε, Πρόκριν τε εἶδον; 326: Ματράν τε, Κλυμένην τε ἴδον.

³ V. 235: ἔθ' ἦτοι πρῶτην Τυρῶ ἴδον.

⁴ V. 387: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Ἀγαμέμνονος; 467: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ κτλ.

⁵ Vv. 391-94. Cfr. 218-20.

⁶ V. 539: ψυχὴ . . . φοῖτα, μακρὰ βιβῶσα, κατ' ἀσφρόδελόν λειμῶνα.

li addolorate¹ e Aiace che lui pure rimane in disparte,² lontano dagli altri morti. Aiace parla con Ulisse, ma senza bere prima il sangue: e Ulisse vede poi Minosse con in mano lo scettro di oro seduto, e attorno a lui le anime sedute o in piedi nella magione di Hades e poi vede Orione che caccia per il prato le belve, e Titio sdraiato sul suolo mentre l'avvoltoio gli rode il fegato, e Tantalo in atto di subire la nota pena, e Sisifo in atto di spingere il masso, e Eracle armato di arco e di uno splendido balteo, che lo riconosce e gli parla. Tuttociò non può avvenire là dove Ulisse ha scavato la fossa; non possiamo pensare che Eracle esca dall'Hades e si metta a camminare a gran passi per il mondo: senza dire che dove si trova Ulisse non vi sono prati di asfodelo. Nè è possibile pensare che intorno a lui stieno le anime e perfino Minosse seduto sul suo trono e i morti in attesa del giudizio, e Tantalo e Titio e Sisifo: tutte queste anime—compreso Minosse seduto sul trono!—non possono esser salite su dall'Hades. E' chiaro che questo prato di asfodelo è il luogo dove stanno tutte queste anime e che questo luogo è tutt'una cosa col sito indicato prima con il *quivi*.

Ma qui di nuovo il contenuto del racconto cambia e ritorna a quel che era in principio: Eracle ritorna nella casa di Hades e Ulisse resta in attesa se vengono altre anime. Una moltitudine immensa di anime si aduna con grande strepito e Ulisse, temendo che gli si presenti la Gorgone, fugge alla nave. Vale a dire quest'ultima parte del racconto presuppone di nuovo che Ulisse sia, come in principio, vicino alla sua fossa, sulla terra e che le anime salgano a lui.

Abbiamo dunque intrecciate due narrazioni diverse che chiameremo A e B. Secondo A Ulisse evoca le anime e le fa salire dall'Hades, e le anime sono descritte come ombre esangui e parlano con lui dopo aver bevuto il sangue: secondo B Ulisse vede l'oltretomba, i prati di asfodelo, la casa di Hades, Minosse, i dannati, Orione, Eracle: le anime appaiono come persone vive e non bevono il sangue. A viene distinto dall'uso del *venne* B dall'uso del *vidi*: A cioè descrive un *esorcismo*, B descrive una *visione*. Abbiamo dunque due Nekyie diverse intrecciate: e per isolare le due Nekyie l'una dall'altra basta separare dal testo omerico il racconto con *venne* da quello con *vidi* sopprimendo

¹ Vv. 541-42: αἱ δ' ἄλλαι ψυχαί. . . ἔστασαν ἀχνόμεναι.

² V. 544: νόσφι ἀφεστήκει.

insieme la conversazione di Ulisse con Alcinoο e cioè dal v. 235 al 385 (compresa la interruzione) e poi dal v. 538 dove Achille è descritto di un tratto mentre si allontana sul prato di asfodelo fino al v. 627, quando Eracle ridiscende nell'Hades. Così facendo si ottengono due Nekyie distinte:

A: vv. 51-234, 385-537, 627-35

B: vv. 235-327, 538-626

restano estranei tanto ad A quanto a B i v. 327-84 che contengono la conversazione con i Traci. In due soli punti il linguaggio di A B fu applicato ad A e cioè al v. 155 dove Anticlea dopo esser salita su dalla fossa chiede a Ulisse come mai egli sia giunto nell'Hades e al v. 475 dove Achille fa la stessa domanda: del resto le due Nekyie sono perfettamente distinte e riconoscibili.

Le istruzioni che Circe dà ad Ulisse sono contraddittorie. Da prima ella gli dice che deve passare con la nave l'Oceano e arrivare ai boschetti di Persefone, poi dice che deve recarsi nella casa di Aide dove scorrono l'Acheronte il Piriflegetonte, il Cocito e lo Stige, e poi gli prescrive di scavare, dopo esser approdato, la fossa:¹ è chiaro che i versi nei quali si annunzia a Ulisse che dovrà scendere nell'Hades sono stati interpolati allo scopo di mettere in armonia la prescrizione di Circe con la Nekyia B.²

Un'altra interpolazione dovuta al desiderio di armonizzare le due concezioni così opposte alle anime, è contenuta nei versi 39-43, dove si descrivono i morti non come ombre vane ma simili a quel che erano da vivi, perfino con le loro ferite.

¹ x. 508 s: 'Αλλ' ὅπῳτ' ἂν δὴ νῆϊ δέ' Ὀκεανοῖο περήσῃς
ἔσθ' ἀκτὴ τε λάχεια καὶ ἄλσέα Περσεφονείης
μακραί τ' αἰγίροι καὶ ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι·
νῆα μὲν αὐτοῦ κέλσαι ἐπ' Ὀκεανῷ βαθυδίνῃ,
αὐτὸς δ' εἰς Αἰδὼν ἵεναι δόμον εὐρώεντα.
Ἐνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ρέουσιν
Κῶκυνός θ', ὅς δὴ Στυγὸς ὕδατος ἔστιν ἀπορρώξ·
πέτρῃ τε ξύνεσις τε δύο ποταμῶν ἱριδοῦπων·
ἐνθα δ' ἔπειθ', ἦρως, χριμφθείς πέλας, ὥς σε κελεύω,
βέθρον ὀρέξαι, ὅσον τε πυγούσιον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα·
ἅμ' αὐτῷ δὲ χοὴν χεῖσθαι πᾶσιν νεκτέσσιν,
Πρώτα μελικρήτῳ μετέπειτα δὲ ἡδεῖ οἶνω,
τὸ τρίτον αἶθ' ὕδατι· ἐπὶ δ' ἄλφειτα λευκά παλλέινει.

² Egualmente sono dovute all'influenza di B la espressione di Circe in x. 491 e di Ulisse in x. 564 e s: 'Αἰδάο δόμους.

II

Così abbiamo distinto le due Nekyie, l'una omerica originaria, l'altra interpolata.¹ Questa seconda Nekyia è di origine orfica.

Lo dimostra la concordanza tra ciò che in essa è descritto e le scene dei vasi italoti con scene infernali, i quali suppliscono perfettamente alla mancanza di prove puramente filologiche.²

Questi vasi, che sono circa diciannove, tutti, meno uno etrusco, di fabbrica italo-greco per lo più apula³ mostrano vari episodi dell'oltretomba, più o meno riassunti o modificati a seconda della grandezza del vaso e dell'arbitrio del pittore: sono scene di punizione come Tantalo, Sisifo, le Danaidi, Teseo e Piritoo, le quali spesso avvengono in presenza di Hades e Persefone: molti di essi mostrano Orfeo in atto di cantare davanti agli dei infernali, altri mostrano Eracle in atto di trarre Cerbero fuori dell'Hades: in quasi tutti i vasi compaiono come esecutrici della giustizia divina le Erinni.

La concordanza straordinaria che questi vasi mostrano tra loro—tanto che talune figure sono ripetute quasi identiche su parecchi vasi—prova che essi derivano da un originale pittorico comune, che

¹ L'interpolazione di elementi estranei nel l. XI dell'Odissea è stata generalmente ammessa. Wilamowitz (*Hom. Unters.*, pp. 142 e 199) crede interpolati i vv. 563-632. Dümmler (*Kl. Schr.*, II [Lipsia, 1901], 143) lo nega.

² Per aver trascurato questi vasi Ganschiniets (Pauly-Wiasowa, *Realenc.*, X, 2407) si trovò a dover affermare di non sapere in che rapporto sta la Catabasi di Ulisse con le Catabasi orfiche.

³ Sono i seguenti: Cratere apulo di Monaco n° 849 (Reinach, *Rep. des vas. peints*, I, 258, 3), Cratere apulo di Carlsruhe n° 388 (*ibid.*, p. 108), Cratere di Napoli n° 3222 (*ibid.*, p. 167), Frammento apulo della collezione Fenicia (*Mon. ant. Lincei*, XVI, t. III), Cratere apulo dell'Ermitage n° 426 (Reinach, I, 479), Stamno etrusco di Vienna (*ibid.*, p. 343, 2-3), Cratere apulo dell'Ermitage n° 426 (*ibid.*, p. 479), Cratere apulo di Napoli, S. Angelo n° 709 (*ibid.*, p. 453, 1), Cratere apulo del British Museum, F 270 (*ibid.*, p. 356, 1), Cratere apulo di Napoli S. 11 (*ibid.*, L, 401, 2), Frammento apulo di Carlsruhe n° 256 (*ibid.*, I°, 455, 2), Cratere apulo della raccolta Iatta n° 1094 (*ibid.*, p. 356, 4), Cratere apulo dell'Ermitage n° 424 (*ibid.*, p. 355), Anfora Cumana di Berlino 3024 (*ibid.*, p. 330, 3), Idria campana del Museo britannico n° 210 (Panofka, *Mus. Blacas*, t. IX), Anfora apula del Museo brit. n° 270 (Reinach, I, 356, 2), Anfora apula della Collezione Beugnot n° 28 (Winkler, *Darstell. d. Unterwelt*, tavola), Vaso disperso già Hamilton (Reinach, I, 327, 2). Questi vasi furono studiati da Winkler (*De inferor. in vasis Ital. inferioris repraes.* [Breslau, 1878], ripubblicato in *Breslauer phil. Abh.*, III, "Die Darstell. d. Unterwelt auf unterit. Vas."). Letteratura in Kern, *Orphic. frag.* (Berlin, 1822), p. 21; aggiungi, Macchiario, *Orphica* (Napoli, 1915).

possiamo datare alla fine del V° secolo:¹ gli autori antichi parlano spesso di quadri contenenti scene infernali.²

Or non vi è dubbio che questi vasi debbono esser connessi con l'orfismo: lo prova non tanto la presenza di Orfeo quanto piuttosto le strette concordanze tra alcuni particolari di questi vasi e molte credenze orfiche:³ perciò noi dobbiamo attribuire all'originale greco di questi vasi una ispirazione orfica. E non si può negare, d'altro lato, la connessione tra la Nekyia orfica dell'XI libro dell'Odissea e le scene rappresentate su questi vasi; tanto nell'Odissea quanto sui vasi troviamo Minosse, Sisifo, Tantalo e in generale troviamo la concezione dell'Ade come un vero e proprio regno di Hades dove si esercita la giustizia sui malvagi.

La presenza di queste scene orfiche sui vasi dell'Italia meridionale si spiega molto facilmente. La Magna Grecia fu infatti un centro cospicuo di orfismo e di pitagorismo; vicino al sito dell'antica Sibari esisteva una vasta necropoli di iniziati orfici sepolti secondo il loro rito particolare⁴ e probabilmente queste tombe contenevano i resti di quella aristocrazia orfico-pitagorica la quale, dopo aver dominato su quasi tutta la Magna Grecia, fu distrutta e dispersa da una rivolta

¹ Kuhnert, *Jahrbuch d. Archäol. Instituts* (1893), p. 108; Köpp, *Arch. Anzeiger* (1892), p. 128. Per la costruzione dell'originale v. Köhler in *Ann. Inst. corr. arch.* (1864), p. 292, e Kuhnert, *op. cit.*, p. 108 s.

² Dem. C. *Aristog.* A 52 Plaut. *Capit.* V. 4. 1 s. (998), Cic. *Tusc.* i. 16; *Lutat. Plac. ad Stat. Theb.* iv. 516.

³ Per es. la concordanza tra le Erinni come sono descritte nell'inno orfico 68 v. 7, vestite di pelli e le Erinni di alcuni dei vasi, pure vestite di pelli. Nel vaso di Monaco gli Eliadi sono rappresentati con le ferite ricevute in vita come in *Od.* xi. 40 e nella Nekyia vergiliana (*Aen.* vi. 445-50): per l'ispirazione orfica della Nekyia vergiliana v. Norden "Vergilstudien" in *Hermes* (1893), p. 350-405, spec. pp. 385, 393, 405.

Il giovane che si pone una corona in capo nel vaso di Monaco ricorda l'uso di dare una corona ai morti (*Schol. Ar. Lys.* 601). Coronare i morti era rito orfico: nell'iscrizione dei Iobacchi di Atene (Maass, *Orpheus*, pp. 301, 160) si assicura una corona al Jobacco morto. Platone (*Rep.* 363B) descrive i beati che banchettano incoronati V; anche Köhlig, *De coronar. ap. ant. vi atque usu in Relig.-gesch. Versuche*, XIV, 2, 56. Il ragazzo che tira il suo carretto nel vaso di Monaco si connette all'idea orfica che i beati godono nell'al di là i loro piaceri predilletti.

⁴ Sulla esplorazione delle tombe orfiche di Sibari v. Cavallari in *Not. scavi* (1879), pp. 52, 77-82, 122-24, 156-59, 245-53; *ibid.* (1890), pp. 68, 152-62; V. anche Lenormant, *La Grande Grèce*, I, 219. Da queste tombe provengono le lamine auree del Museo di Napoli (Olivieri, *Lamellae orphicae, Kleine Texte*, p. 133; Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n° 32. Sul rito orfico v. Macchioro, *Orphica* (Napoli, 1918), p. 441, e *Orfismo e paolinismo* (Montevarchi, 1922), p. 271 s.

democratica:¹ conosciamo parecchi nomi di orfici nativi della Magna Grecia e della Sicilia:² due lamine plumbee trovate in un sepolcro della fine del 1° secolo vicino a Taranto reca ben 39 nomi di pitagorici:³ a Cuma fu trovata una iscrizione relativa a un recinto funerario dove si seppellivano soltanto orfici.⁴

Tutto ciò prova che l'orfismo era assai antico e assai diffuso in Magna Grecia e spiega come le rappresentazioni orfiche dell'oltre tomba fossero così diffuse da invogliare i ceramisti a ornarne i vasi: tanto più che questi erano destinati come corredo funebre delle tombe e perciò adatti a ricevere simili rappresentazioni oltremondane.

E' notevole che tanto nella Nekyia omerica quanto nelle pitture vascolari non vi è nessun accenno alle beatitudine: vi sono solo descritti e rappresentati tormenti: ciò concorda con tutte le descrizioni dell'oltre tomba che si possono connettere con le concezioni orfiche: nel mito orfico di Er narrato da Platone⁵ sono descritti con vivi particolari le pene ma si allude appena alle beatitudini: egualmente nella visione di Tespesio narrata da Plutarco⁶ una vera e propria beatitudine è appena accennata mentre si descrivono con compiacenza medievale le pene dei malvagi: nella leggenda della discesa di Pitagora all'Hades si narrano le pene che egli vide ma non i godimenti.⁷

Eguale nella Nekyia dipinta da Polignoto sulla base della Nekyia omerica, che noi conosciamo dalla descrizione di Pausania⁸ erano rappresentate solo pene e non beatitudini.

L'orfismo dunque accentuò assai più le descrizioni delle pene oltremondane che non delle beatitudini:⁹ e ciò fece considerando la pena come mezzo necessario per purgare il peccato titanico e diventar beata;¹⁰ la sofferenza aveva perciò nella concezione oltremondana dell'orfismo una importanza assai maggior della gioia; del resto esso usava delle descrizioni delle pene infernali come di un buon esempio e ammonimento per convertire.¹¹

¹ Diod. xii. 9. 4; Diog. L. viii. 8. 89. V. su ciò Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, 230; De Sanctis, *Storia dei Rom.*, I, 179; Pais, *Storia della Sicilia e della M. Grecia*, I, 516-17.

² Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

³ Plut. *De sera num. vind.* 22.

⁴ *Not. scavi* (1880), pp. 34, 189.

⁷ Hieron. ap. Diog. L. viii. 21.

⁵ Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

⁸ Paus. x. 28 = Overbeck, *Schriftg.* 1050.

⁶ Plat. *Rep.* x. 13-14 (p. 614B.)

⁹ Plat. *Rep.* ii. 365A.

¹⁰ Procl. in Plat. *Remp.* ii. 180. 23; (p. 339, 17 [Kroll]).

¹¹ Plat. *Gorg.* 525C.

III

La seconda Nekyia la quale venne interpolata e intrecciata alla primitiva Nekyia omerica è dunque di origine orfica.

La tradizione narrava che la prima redazione scritta dei poemi omerici era avvenuta per ordine di Pisistrato, tiranno di Atene e che tra i dotti che ebbero dal tiranno l'incarico di fissare il testo dei poemi omerici c'era pure il profeta orfico Onomacrito:¹ a lui si attribuiva la interpolazione di alcuni versi nella Nekyia omerica che del resto non hanno alcuna importanza.² Si narrava anche che aveva ordinato e manipolato falsificandoli gli oracoli di Museo e che per ciò Ipparco lo aveva cacciato da Atene:³ era ritenuto autore e raccoglitore di scritti e poemi orfici.⁴

Cercando di sceverare la leggenda dalla storia, noi certo non crederemo che prima di Pisistrato non esistesse la minima redazione scritta dei poemi omerici e cioè che fino al VI secolo la scrittura non fosse stata mai usata per fissare il testo dei poemi, nè crederemo alla nomina di una vera e propria commissione di dotti incaricati di questa operazione, nè che Onomacrito fosse un falsificatore di testi degno di esser espulso dalla città: però possiamo benissimo credere che Pisistrato desse impulso alla diffusione scritta dei poemi omerici, che sotto di lui e appunto grazie a questo impulso i poemi vennero quà e là rimaneggiati, che d'altro lato gli orfici, potenti allora ad Atene, si valessero dell'occasione per introdurre delle interpolazioni nei poemi in armonia con la loro dottrina.⁵

Comunque sia ciò, il fatto importante è che senza alcun dubbio la Nekyia omerica primitiva fu completamente trasformata mercé la interpolazione di una *Catabasi* orfica. E per quanto sia assai facile per noi riconoscere l'interpolazione—meno facile dovette esser per i greci che vedevano i poemi omerici da un punto di vista poetico e

¹ Tzet. in *Aristophan. proem.*, Περὶ κωμῶδ.; Kaibel, *Fr. Com. Gr.*, I, 20 = Kern, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 189.

² i. 602-4, dell'XI libro secondo uno scoliaste (Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 55, n. 190).

³ Herod. vii. 6 = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

⁴ Clem. *Al. Strom.* i. 21; ii. 81. I St. = Eus. *Praep. ev.* x. 11. 30 (p. 575D) = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 183; *Ser. Emp. Pyrrh. Hypot.* iii. 30 = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 187; Paus. viii. 37.5 = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 193; Philippon. in *Arist. De an. A* 5 (p. 186, 24, Hayd. = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 188); Suid., s.v. = Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁵ V. sulla commissione pisistratea e sull'orfismo ad Atene Gruppe, in Roscher, *Lex.*, III, 1133 s.

religioso più che critico—il risultato fu quello che certo gli orfici desideravano: e cioè la Nekyia omerica acquistò in complesso il carattere del racconto di una *discesa* nell'Hades. Come tale la considerarono gli antichi stessi e anche qualche moderno.¹ Il barbaro e primitivo esorcismo omerico mediante il quale le anime dei morti erano attratte dal desiderio del sangue passò in seconda linea e l'intera Nekyia apparve in sostanza come il racconto di una cosa assai più augusta e terribile; la discesa di un uomo vivo nella dimora dei morti e il racconto di ciò che ivi aveva veduto.

Perchè l'orfismo dava tanta importanza a queste trasformazioni della Nekyia omerica?

Per l'orfismo era un punto essenziale il credere alla realtà e alla concretezza della vita oltremondana da un lato e alla punizione e alla beatitudine dall'altra. La beatitudine oltremondana, cioè il godimento reale di gioie di tipo terreno e umano, era non già un premio della virtù ma una conseguenza della iniziazione:² da ciò la conseguenza che soltanto colui che fosse stato iniziato aveva diritto alla beatitudine oltremondana, e la concezione dell'iniziato come di un essere privilegiato.³ Per affermar tuttociò e cioè per pensare alle gioie oltremondane come a un premio riserbato agli iniziati, occorreva affermare rigorosamente la realtà e la concretezza dell'oltretomba, concepirlo non come un mondo vago confuso nebbioso, ma come un mondo preciso, reale, simile in fondo al nostro, nel quale era possibile per gli iniziati godere di quelle gioie perfettamente terrene che loro prometteva l'orfismo, cioè la musica, il canto, il banchetto, la danza e simili e un beato soggiorno in una bellissima regione.⁴ Da ciò l'im-

¹ V; Le testimonianze antiche in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, X, 2405 (Ganschiniets). Joh. Schmidt (Roscher, *op. cit.*, III, 626) parla come se Ulisse fosse davvero sceso nell'Hades.

² Secondo l'inno a Demetra (vv. 466 s.) solo chi è stato iniziato ha la beatitudine. Secondo la dottrina orfica il profano era destinato a giacere nel fango (Plat. *Phaed.* 69C).

³ Esso diventava un dio, come dice una delle lamine orfiche di Sibari (Kaibel, I, 657; Diels, *Vorsokratiker*³, II, 177, n. 20) Cfr. *Carm. aur.* 71 e *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 1158) o abitava con gli dei (Plat. *Phaed.* 69c) o abitava nel cielo (Diog. L. viii. 1. 31; *Carm. Aur.* 70; *Procl. In Plat. Remp.* ii. 129, 1 s (Kroll); ii. 132. 19 s. (Kroll); *Ps-Pind.*, frag. 132 (Bergk-Schroeder); *CIA*, I, 442; Kaibel, *Epigr. exap.*, coll. 41. Cfr. *Epich.*, frag. 22 (Diels); Eurip. *Suppl.* 5335; *Ps.-Heracl. Ep.* v. 73. 1 s. (Bywater).

⁴ Sulla beatitudine oltremondana orfica v. *Pind.*, frag. 129-30 (Bergk 5 Schröder); *Pind. Ol.* ii. 108 s; *Ps. Plat. Az.* 13; *Ar. Ran.* 372 s.; *Soph.*, frag. 755 (Nauck); *Plat. Rep.* ii. 363; *Plut. Non posse suav. vivi*, 1105A; *Verg. Aen.* vi. 638 s.; *Tib. i.* 3. 59.

portanza enorme della Katabasis, cioè della discesa all'Hades, e del racconto di ciò che ivi vede chi ci va e il gran numero delle Catabasi orfiche:¹ la catabasi era per l'orfismo una specie di testimonianza, il racconto di chi narrò ciò che realmente ha veduto con i suoi propri occhi. La Catabasi che era narrata e descritta nei libri canonici dell'orfismo (la più importante era quella attribuita a Orfeo stesso) era per l'Orfico la base della sua speranza oltremondana, la promessa della futura beatitudine.

Ora è naturalissimo che quando, circa nel VI secolo, l'orfismo cominciò a diffondersi in Grecia, esso pensasse a valersi come mezzo di diffusione dei poemi omerici, che erano la vera Bibbia dei greci e il fondamento della loro coscienza religiosa.² Ora i poemi omerici, mentre offrivano scarsa opportunità in generale alla penetrazione orfica, avevano un'opportunità di prim'ordine nel racconto della Nekyia omerica: in esso poteva innestarsi la dottrina che più di ogni altra distingueva l'orfismo, la vera pietra angolare della fede orfica: la dottrina oltremondana. Con un'abile interpolazione la Nekyia omerica poteva venir trasformata e i poemi omerici diventar uno strumento potentissimo di diffusione delle dottrine oltremondane orfiche. E gli orfici non si lasciarono sfuggire l'occasione. Essi agirono così come agirono per es. gli interpolatori della Bibbia e del Vangelo, i quali si avvalsero della autorità del libro sacro come di una testimonianza o di una prova della verità della loro dottrina.

Così la primitiva Nekyomanteia, operazione di esorcismo magico molto frequente in Grecia³ diventò una Catabasi: non già come qualcuno crede⁴ perchè in origine le due cose formassero tutt'uno, chè anzi come abbiamo veduto lo Nekyomanteia (cioè l'esorcizzare i morti e farli uscire dagli inferi) in certo modo esclude o rende inutile la catabasi (cioè il discendere giù tra i morti) ma perchè alla Nekyomanteia si sostituì la Katabasis.

¹ Se ne attribuivano a Prodicò, a Cercòpe a Orfeo, a Orfeo di Camarina (Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 304).

² Erodoto (II, 50-53) dice che furono Esiodo e Omero a fissare le genealogie i tipi, i culti, i nomi degli dei.

³ V. esempi in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, X, 2373 (Ganschinietz).

⁴ Ganschinietz, *ibid.*, p. 2373) crede che originariamente Nekyomanteia e Katabasis formassero una sola cosa.

Così il racconto omerico mutò completamente carattere e contenuto.

La storia diede origine agli orfici. La nuova concezione, grazie all'enorme influenza dei poemi omerici, soffocò completamente la vecchia concezione vaga oscura confusa della vita oltremondana: e popolarissime divennero le descrizioni orfiche del Tartaro e degli Elisi, di Tantalo, di Sisifo, delle Danaidi, di Minosse.

Così una nuova concezione si impossessava della coscienza greca: l'idea della retribuzione oltremondana, l'idea cioè che dal nostro agire qui in terra dipende in qualche modo il nostro godere e il nostro soffrire nell'oltre tomba. Gli orfici certo erano molto lontani dal concepire la retribuzione oltremondana come fatto spirituale, e molto cammino ancora si dovette l'uomo percorrere prima di arrivare a questa concezione. Ma la barbara concezione dell'oltre tomba come di un luogo oscuro tedioso informe, dove l'anima non è né viva né morta e inutilmente ripensa alla vita perduta, dove non vi è né gioia né dolore, né premio né pena e dove unico sentimento è la consapevolezza che non vi è alcun rapporto con la vita terrena: questa sconsolata concezione omerica fu vinta da un'altra concezione che in modo ingenuo e primitivo affermava tutt' un altro principio: la continuità tra la vita e la morte. Principio che diverrà in seguito il cardine fondamentale del cristianesimo.

NAPLES

THE KALENDARIVM AGAIN

BY HENRY A. SANDERS

IN A note in the October number of this *Journal* last year I suggested an expansion of a puzzling abbreviation. As corrections in the published text or emendations of two out of the five known tablets were necessary, only a general survey of the material for defining the term *Kalendarium* was attempted, and this was based in part on assumptions made by the editors of the different tablets or by myself. To some of these objections have been raised by correspondents, though one of my suggested corrections has been confirmed by Professor Schubart, who examined the tablet in Berlin. Also the possibility of emending the irreconcilable number in the Cairo tablet has been made more probable by a photograph furnished me by Professor Dittmann, which shows numerous errors in the tablet. Therefore it seems in place to treat the subject more fully and without the possibly unwarranted assumptions.

If the abbreviation *ad K* at the end of the various waxed tablets containing birth certificates means *ad Kalendarium*, then the *Kalendarium* must have been a monthly record and the numbers of the tablets recorded on each must agree with some enumeration of the months. But there are other difficulties that must be settled first. Every one of the five tablets contains the consulship dating repeated either twice or in three cases three times. Also a sixth tablet, *Aegyptische Urkunden*, Band VII, No. 1693, shows the same duplication of dating, though the number of the tablet in the public record is lost with the end of the document. Also in all six of the tablets the year of the emperor's reign is given twice. In such repetitions which record the beginning of the series of tablets for the year as well as the date of the certificate in question, one may expect a difference in the dating between consulships or between imperial years.

Taking up the imperial years first perfect agreement is found between the two datings on four of the tablets. There is only one case where two imperial years are given on the same tablet, *Aegyptische Urkunden*, Band VII, No. 1694, and there the consular years are the

same. The date of registration of the certificate was November 22, and the tablet was issued under Marcus Aurelius, whose reign began March 8, 161 A.D. By assuming that the tablet record was made according to the Roman consular year or with the tribunician year of the emperor the double dating by imperial years in this tablet can be justified, but the use of the tribunician year would call for double dating in the consular years, which is not found in this tablet. It is therefore inadmissible as an explanation in this case.

In *Aegyptische Urkunden*, Band VII, No. 1692, the editors have read *anno VI[I]* for the beginning of the record, and *anno VIII* for the date of the certificate, October 15. This falls in the reign of Antoninus Pius and, as his reign began on July 10, the same explanation suffices. In fact, this is doubtless the reason why the editors read *VI[I]* instead of *VI[II]* as the correction to the illegible number. But of the other two tablets in the time of Antoninus Pius one, Cairo 29807, would then also call for double dating by imperial years, as the certificate is dated in November. Yet the number of the imperial year is given the same in both references. It is clear from this that the illegible number in *Aeg. Urk.*, No. 1692, should be corrected to give the same dating in imperial years, but it does not follow that *Aeg. Urk.*, No. 1694, should be emended. This is a sole certificate from the reign of Marcus Aurelius and a change in the system of keeping the birth records may well have occurred at that time. To be sure a confusion between *III* and *IIII* would be very easy in copying, but until further evidence is available the only reasonable conclusion is that there was a change in the system of keeping the birth records near the beginning of the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

The earlier system of keeping the birth records was by imperial years, for there are double consular datings in three of the tablets. It was pointed out by Kelsey¹ and by Viereck and Zucker² that the system of the tablets in the birth records did not correspond with the consular year. Kelsey suggested the imperial year as the basis, since it was mentioned in the tablet, and that explanation is now found to hold not only for this birth certificate of the reign of Hadrian, but also for the three from the reign of Antoninus Pius. However, the earlier tablet under Trajan³ does not admit of this explanation as it

¹ *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, LIV, 193. ² *Aeg. Urk.*, VII, 207. ³ *Ibid.*, 1691.

was dated on June 30 and Trajan took office some time after January 27, the death of Nerva. The same consulship would be repeated on this tablet, if the record was kept by the imperial year. To explain the difference in consular dating, while the imperial year is repeated unchanged, is an insoluble problem unless it is assumed that the imperial year given on the tablet is the tribunician year of the emperor and the birth record was kept by tribunician years. This system will however apply to none of the other birth certificates, and is in itself extremely doubtful. Furthermore, in this very tablet the dating, if by the imperial year, seems to me to be wrong. In line 2 of the tablet after the names of the consuls for 109 A.D. the editors supply [*pr(idie)*] *K(alendas) Jul(l)ias anno XII Imp(eratoris) Cal(es)aris Ner(vae) Traiani*. This number of the imperial year, though supplied, seems right, but below in lines 8-9 they read *Appio Annio [Gallo M. Atilio Br]adua co(n)s(ulibus). anno XII [Imp. . .]*. These were the consuls for 108, which was the eleventh year of the imperial rule, but the twelfth tribunician year began December 10, 108, so that we seem to have confirmation that both the birth records and the dating were by tribunician years under Trajan. It must however be admitted that this tablet is very fragmentary and difficult to read, and further evidence from the same time is needed before this unusual interpretation is considered established. If it is assumed that the dating by the imperial year is too doubtful to warrant acceptance, then the variation in the consular datings can be explained equally well by assuming that the birth records were kept on tablets arranged according to the Egyptian year. Of that more below. For the present the assumption seems necessary that there was a change in the system of keeping the birth records at the end of the reign of Trajan and another at the beginning of the rule of Marcus Aurelius. Before going on, however, we must admit that for the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius the consular and imperial datings on the four tablets known can also be satisfied by supposing the birth records kept according to the Egyptian year. None of the certificates is dated between July 10, the accession of Antoninus Pius, and August 29, the beginning of the Egyptian year.

Keeping these results and possibilities in mind we may now consider the references by tablet and page to the public record. That the

discussion may be more clear the necessary facts are arranged in Table I, doubtful numbers being marked with a question.

TABLE I

Tablet Number	Birth	Registration Date	Certificate Date	Recorded On
1691.....	June 3	June 27	June 30	<i>tab VI item pag II</i>
766.....	Mar. 3	Mar. 27	April 13	<i>tab VIII pag II et post alia pag IX</i>
1692.....	Aug. 18	Sept. 3	Oct. 15	<i>tab II et post alia pag II item pag III</i>
29807.....	Aug. 20	Sept. 14	Nov. 3	<i>tab (II or V ?) et post alia pagina VIII</i>
1694.....	July 19	Aug. 9	Nov. 22	<i>tabul IIII pag V</i>

There are two references to the public record in each of the tablets except one, which has three. In only one certificate is there a page number given in the first reference. It is not impossible that *item* or *et post alia* is to be supplied before *pag II* in certificate 766. We certainly understand this insertion in *Aeg. Urk.*, No. 1694, where the broad space left between *tabul IIII* and *pag V* suggests that they are separate references. Presumably *pagina I* should be assumed for the first insertion in the record in each case except the one that has the page number given.

The birth date and certificate date are given clearly each time, but the registration date follows the references to the public record, so that it is questionable to which entry in the record it applies, though one is inclined to refer it to the last entry. We know that after the edict of Marcus Aurelius the birth had to be recorded within thirty days. That requirement is met in every case. But if only a report of the birth was required and this was accepted *citra causarum cognitionem*, what legal value could a certificate of this record have, and why should there be more than one entry in the record? It seems necessary to assume a certain period of publication and thereafter the insertion of the legal registration in the public record. A copy made from this record must contain the reference to all entries and was thereby both a birth certificate and a proof of Roman citizenship.

The dates of the certificates follow the dates of registration at varying intervals. In one case the certificate was issued on the third day after. This seems to require that the registration date given in the certificates be the date of final, legal registration. How long before this must the first entry in the record, the publication of the birth,

have taken place? The time between the dates of birth and final registration varies from sixteen to twenty-five days. But sixteen days, if counted by the Roman method, gives the seventeen-day publication period necessary for voting a law by the assembly in the last century of the republic. That covered the space of three market days, and so was a natural period of publication. The important conclusion to draw from this combination is that the registration dates given in the birth certificates are exactly what one would expect from their position in the record, namely, the date of the final entry.

It follows from this that the first entry must have preceded by a reasonable publication period and that the number of the tablet was probably determined by the date of the first entry. This is, however, merely an assumption, and both possibilities must be considered in the following discussion.

With this preface we proceed to the consideration of the tablet numbers in the different birth certificates. Above in the discussion of the dates of the certificates it was shown that the record could not have been regularly kept by consular years, and that conclusion is confirmed by the numbers of the tablets. In only one case, *Aeg. Urk.*, No. 1691, does the tablet number agree with the number of the Roman month. This may well be accidental, especially if any other explanation can be found.

The Egyptian year has been considered a possibility or even a probability, but it works no better. In only one case, *Mich. Pap.* 766, does the Egyptian month number agree with the number of the tablet, and even in that case we have to consider the tablet number determined by the date of final registration, which gives the date *Pharmouthi 1*, a date quite irreconcilable with *pagina II et post alia pagina IX* of the reference to the records, for these are the highest reference numbers found on any tablet and should imply not the first day but the latter part of the month.

In only one case can the tablet number be made to agree with the month of the tribunician year, again *Aeg. Urk.*, No. 1691, under Trajan, and the assumption of a new set of tribunician months, running from the tenth of the Roman month to the ninth of the following, would be necessary, as well as a slightly longer publication period. Therefore, if we are to maintain the equality of the month and tablet

numbers in the majority of the certificates, we must find it in the use of the imperial year for determining the arrangement of the *Kalendarium*. But even in this it is obvious that more than one system of reckoning is possible. The accession of an emperor did not fall on the first of a month either by Roman or Egyptian reckoning. Therefore a new tablet may have been started on the accession day, or the officials may have waited until the beginning of the following month. Whether the Roman or the Egyptian month is used, there will be two possibilities under each: either that the month of the accession was counted as the first month of the record, or that the following month was so counted. Under each of these we should give the month number of the assumed publication of the birth and also that of the final registration. Thus there are eight possible ways of reckoning, to which must be added two from the actual months of the emperor's rule, reckoned each time from the day of accession. The date of Trajan's accession is not known to me, but it cannot have been earlier than February 1, which has been assumed in this discussion. To make the matter perfectly clear the necessary data are arranged in Table II and the resulting month numbers in Table III.

TABLE II

DOCUMENT	EMPEROR	DATE OF ACCESSION		TAB. No.	FIRST REGISTRATION		FINAL REGISTRATION	
		Roman	Egyptian		Roman	Egyptian	Roman	Egyptian
1691.....	Trajan	Feb. 1?	Mechir 5	VI	June 11	Pauni 17	June 27	Epiph 3
766.....	Hadrian	Aug. 11	Mesore 18	VIII	Mar. 11	Pharmon. 15	Mar. 27	Pharmou. 1
1692.....	Ant. Pius	July 10	Epiph 16	II	Aug. 18	Mesore 25	Sept. 11	Thoth 13
29807.....	Ant. Pius	July 10	Epiph 16	II? or V	Aug. 29	Thoth 1	Sept. 14	Thoth 16
1694.....	Marc. Aurel.	Mar. 8	Phamen. 12	IIII	July 24	Epiph 30	Aug. 9	Mesore 16

TABLE III

DOCUMENT	NUMBERS OF ROMAN MONTHS				NUMBERS OF EGYPTIAN MONTHS				EMPEROR YEAR	
	With Accession Month		Following Month		With Accession Month		Following Month		1st Regis.	Final Regis.
	1st Regis.	Final Regis.	1st Regis.	Final Regis.	1st Regis.	Final Regis.	1st Regis.	Final Regis.		
1691.....	V	V	IV	IV	V	VI	IV	V	V	VI
766.....	VIII	VIII	VII	VII	VIII	IX	VII	VIII	VIII	VIII
1692.....	II	III	I	II	II	III	I	II	II	III
29807.....	II	III	I	II	III	III	II	II	II	III
1694.....	V	VI	IV	V	V	VI	IV	V	V	V

By comparing the tablet numbers in Roman numerals in Table II with the month numbers in Roman numerals in Table III the agreements and disagreements can be quickly seen. The general accord between the tablet numbers and the months of the emperor's year is apparent, yet none of the systems of reckoning chosen gives perfect agreement. Probably it is too much to expect that perfect consistency should have been maintained for a period of over fifty years.

In considering the datings by consular and imperial years above it was found that neither the first tablet, under Trajan, nor the last, under Marcus Aurelius, harmonized with a system of records kept by imperial months, while such a system was required to explain the dates in the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. The same condition is found in these tables. The tablet numbers given in the certificates from the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius agree perfectly with the numbers of the emperor's months by three of the systems of reckoning used. The tablet numbers given in the other two certificates do not agree with these or with each other, though the variation is generally but a single month. This seems to indicate that a different system was used in the reigns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. For the intervening reigns the birth records were kept by the emperor's months, and the number of the tablet was probably determined by the date of the first registration or publication of the birth.

We have seen above that the dates in certificate 1691 of the reign of Trajan can be defended only on the ground that the record was kept by the tribunician year, and also that by supposing the first registration to have occurred eighteen days before the final registration instead of the sixteen apparently required, the tablet number was brought into agreement with the month of the tribunician year. As there is no other rational method of harmonizing the statements of this sole birth certificate from the time of Trajan, it seems necessary to assume that system of dating and recording until other evidence is brought to light. In the tables above it can be seen that Tablet II in certificate 29807 is in close harmony with all the systems of reckoning, but the more likely reading *V* is in agreement with none. It is necessary to read or to emend the tablet number so as to secure *tabula II*, the correct reference.

We have still to reconcile the tablet number in certificate 1694

of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and this is the document in which it was noted above that different datings were given in the imperial years. There I pointed out that this dating was consistent only with a system of dating the birth certificates according to the Roman consular years. If that were not done, then the difference in the imperial years must be removed by emendation. The correction, however, of that discrepancy by emendation will not help us with the tablet number given here. Of course if we decide that the emendation must be made or the false dating disregarded, it is easy to see from Table III how a change to the month following the accession for the first birth tablet of the year would reconcile the number of the month with the tablet number here given. I must not, however, omit to point out that if the tablet number is emended from *IIII* to *VII*, an easy error as the tablet is only a copy from the public record, it gives the proper tablet number for July according to the consular year, and that is exactly the system required to explain the double imperial dating. If emendation must be resorted to, I prefer this. In the photograph of the tablet I read *IIII* for the tablet number as the editors have published it.

Perhaps little more has been established than was shown by the earlier article, but the fact that difficulty arises regarding the tablet numbers of those birth certificates, which show different systems of dating, is not without importance.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

NOTES ON ACHAEAN PROSOPOGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGY

BY ALLEN B. WEST

IN AN inscription found at Delphi celebrating the athletic victories of three young women who contested in the Isthmian, Nemean, and Pythian games, the names of the agonothetae who presided over the games are recorded. From these names it is possible to date the victories of the sisters. The inscription has been published by Pomtow,¹ with a commentary on various points of interest in the document. The purpose of this paper is to consider some of the questions proposed by Pomtow from the Greek, rather than from the narrow Delphian point of view. The inscription, as we shall see, is an excellent illustration of the community life of Hellas during the first century of the Empire.

As a convenient point of departure I shall summarize in Table I the careers of the young women, giving in parentheses the contents of a similar table prepared by Pomtow where his conclusions are at variance with those that I have reached. From the dates in parentheses it will be at once clear that Pomtow's initial error was in assigning the Isthmia to even years, 42, 44, and 46, whereas the celebration of the Isthmia fell at this time in odd years, 41, 43, 45, etc.²

A second oversight resulted in making Antigonus agonothetes of the Isthmia in the year when Dionysia was victorious. There is a lacuna in the inscription at the point where the name of the games once stood. Consequently, certainty is impossible, but there is no reason whatsoever for adopting Pomtow's restoration "Ισθµια, and there are strong reasons for choosing another. In the first place, the

¹ *Klio*, XV, 71, Nos. 100, 101; Dittenberger, *Syll*³, 802.

² The source of this error is possibly to be found in the statement frequently made that the Nemea and the Isthmia were celebrated in the second and fourth years of an Olympiad. This is true in part, but since the Nemea were held in the summer and the Isthmia in the following spring, identity of Olympic years does not mean identity of Julian years. As the Isthmia were held in the odd years of our era, the Nemea must have been celebrated in years divisible by two. The Asclapies came seven days after the Isthmia (see Unger, *Phil.*, XXXIV, 60-64; XXXVII, 1 ff.; *Chron.*, p. 771; Boethius, *Der argivische Kalendar*, 68).

TABLE I

Date of Victory	Name of Victor	Name of Games	Character of Contest	Name and Ethnic of Agonothetes
39 (43)	Tryphosa	Pythia	στάδιον	Antigonus, Argive (Delphus)
41 (46)	Tryphosa	Isthmia	στάδιον	Juventius Proclus, Corinthian
41	Hedea	Sebastea	καὶ δας κισσαροδοίς στάδιον	Novius, Athenian
43 (47)	Tryphosa	Pythia		Cleomachidas, Nicopolitan (Delphus)
43 (42)	Hedea	Isthmia	ἐνόπλιον ἄρματι	Cornelius Pulcher, Epidaurian, and Corinthian (Epid.)
44	Hedea	Nemea	στάδιον	Antigonus, Argive (Delphus)
44	Dionysia	Sebastea or Heraea at Argos (Isthmia)	στάδιον	Antigonus, Argive (Delphus)
45 (?) (44) ...	Hedea	ἐν Σικυνῶνι	στάδιον	Menoetas
45 (?) (44) ...	Dionysia	Asclepiea	στάδιον	Nicoteles, Epidaurian

Isthmia was a festival under the control of the Roman colony of Corinth,¹ and its agonothetae seem always to have been Corinthian citizens. In other words, they possessed Roman citizenship. It is true that some of the agonothetae are known to have been prominent men from other cities of the province. Nevertheless, we must assume that at the same time they possessed the freedom of the Roman colony of Corinth. As examples, one may cite Cornelius Pulcher of Epidaurus, a member of a noble family closely associated with Corinth for more than one generation.² The Euryclids of Sparta also furnish illustrations of this practice. Two of them were agonothetae, and probably three held the duumvirate and other Corinthian offices.³

It is useless to go through the list of Isthmian agonothetae to prove our point, for the rule that they must be Romans is well illustrated by the inscription we are discussing. The only Roman citizens there listed are Isthmian agonothetae. Antigonus was not a Roman citizen, although he became one not long afterward, as we shall show. In fact, every agonothetes with the possible exception of Menoetas, of whose further career we know nothing, probably became a Tiberius Claudius.⁴

Granting that Antigonus was not a Corinthian and did not preside over Isthmian games, we must now try to discover both his identity and the name of the games which he supervised. Since he served both

¹ From Paus. ii. 2. 2 and Dio Chrys. ix. 10 we learn that Corinth had charge of the games, and this statement seems to be borne out by the epigraphical evidence.

² See below, p. 268, n. 3.

³ *AJA*, XXX (1926), 389-400.

⁴ Whether Cleomachidas, or a later member of his family, received citizenship is not quite certain. See below, p. 268.

at Argos and at Delphi, he may have been either a Delphian or an Argive. Now Argives by virtue of their membership in the Amphictyonic League were eligible to the highest honors within the power of the league to bestow. Delphians, on the contrary, were not by virtue of their birth eligible to local Argive offices. Thus the fact that Antigonus was agonothetes of the Argive Nemea makes it probable that he was an Argive.

Such an assumption at once suggests the restoration for the lacuna of our inscription. Intimately connected with the Nemea at this period were two sets of pentaeteric games, alternating with one another, the Heraea and the Caesarea (called also Sebastea about this time).¹ The man who presided over the Nemea also supervised the associated festival. Thus Antigonus as president of the Nemea was *ex officio* agonothetes of the Heraea, or of the Sebastea (Caesarea) if the latter happened to fall in his year of office.²

Instead of giving to Antigonus a third agonothesia in non-Argive games we can now restore in the lacuna an Argive festival over which he is known to have presided. Still it is impossible to be certain whether the word *Ἡραῖα* or *Σεβαστεῖα* is to be restored, for the exact year in which each was held is not known.

I venture to suggest that the Sebastea were celebrated with the Nemea in the year of Antigonus' agonothesia, since the latter received Roman citizenship at the hands of Claudius. Roman citizenship was often granted to men who had distinguished themselves as agonothetae of imperial games. We shall have occasion later to speak of the two agonothetae Novius and Nicoteles, both of whom were granted Roman citizenship under Claudius. It is unnecessary to multiply examples. Nevertheless, our suggestion lays no claim to finality, for Antigonus also presided at Delphi, and Delphian agonothetae frequently were honored with the imperial name.

Up to this point the Argive origin of Antigonus has been taken

¹ For the Nemea, Heraea, and imperial games celebrated by Argos, see Boethius, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-61, 68.

² The date at which the name *Sebastea* replaced *Caesarea* as the official title of the Argive games is uncertain, but as the first known agonothetes of Argive Sebastea was Ti. Claudius Diodotus, or possibly a Regulus named after the governor P. Memmius Regulus, one may hazard the conjecture that the change of name took place under Claudius (see *IG*, IV, 586, 606).

for granted, but fortunately we are not left in doubt, for a Ti. Claudius Antigonus is known to have been Argive senator at this time.¹ There can be little doubt about the identity of the man. The senator was unquestionably the agonothetes of the Nemea. Thus all the evidence points to the correctness of our refusal to accept Pomtow's views as to his Delphian origin. Antigonus may still have been a Delphian, since Delphi was liberal with grants of citizenship to generous patrons of the Pythian games, but Delphian citizenship cannot arbitrarily be assumed because of the office which he held.

Leaving Antigonus for the moment, we must now attempt to fix the years in which the second girl, Hedeia, won her victories. We begin with her successful appearance at the Athenian Sebasteia when Novius presided. Since her victory is recorded as *παῖδας καθαρωδούς*, as a sort of appendix to her athletic honors, it is clear that it must precede victories won after she had come of age to compete in contests for adults. Now the agonothesia of Novius almost certainly fell in the year 41, the first celebration of Sebasteia during the reign of Claudius.² Thus we have a fixed point of chronology from which to depart. Hedeia's next victory was at the Isthmus under Cornelius Pulcher, her third in the Nemean games. Pomtow has pointed out that an athlete's prime is brief, and we shall assume with him that the victories were closely crowded together. The first Isthmia after Hedeia's Athenian victory was in the year 43. To this and the following years we shall assign the Isthmian and Nemean contests which she won.

The third sister, Dionysia, if we are right in assigning to Antigonus the Sebasteia (or Heraea) celebrated as an adjunct to the Nemea, also won a victory in 44. This was her first.³ Her second was won at the Asclapieia in Epidaurus, games which were celebrated in Isthmian years. We can date this victory probably in 45. The last victory of Hedeia, the second sister, likewise probably occurred in this year, al-

¹ Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne*, XLVII, 116, 266.

² A discussion of this point would take us too far afield. The date is probable, though not certain. The year of Novius' agonothesia depends upon the date given to IG, III, 457, 613 (cf. p. 268, n. 1).

³ Pomtow thought that the victories of the three maidens were won in competition with men. Nevertheless, it is possible that Dionysia's initial success was gained in a race with her own sex, for at the Heraea in Elis and in other Doric cities contests for women were held. They would be an appropriate addition for the Argive Heraea. Unfortunately for this conjecture, no evidence for their existence is known.

though nothing is known about the games in Sicyon where she won the foot-race.

We have still to consider the record of Tryphosa, which contained two victories in the Pythia under Antigonos and Cleomachidas and a third on the Isthmus *κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς*. Pomtow is probably right in thinking that the Isthmian victory fell between two Pythian successes, and we have adopted his interpretation. The question remains whether she was younger or older than her sisters. Since the Isthmia of 43 have been assigned to Cornelius Pulcher because of the record of Hedeia, we may choose either 41 or 45 for Tryphosa and Juventius Proclus. If we take the second of the possibilities, Tryphosa's career extended from the Pythia of 43 to the year 47, as Pomtow has assumed, and the victories of the three girls would have been almost contemporaneous, since Hedeia was first successful in 43 and Dionysia in 44. It would be better to separate the victories slightly and to assume that Tryphosa, as the elder, had begun her career somewhat earlier.

A more serious objection, however, can be urged against this arrangement. The Pythian agonothetae at this time were identical with the epimeletae of the Amphictyonic League. These officers functioned for the four years of a Pythiad.¹ On this assumption Antigonos and Cleomachidas were epimeletae. Other epimeletae for this period are known.

35-39.....Callistratus [Pomtow, *Klio*, XVII, 166, No. 152]

39-43.....Antigonos

43-47.....Cleomachidas

47-51.....Sosander of Hypata [Pomtow, *op. cit.*, XVII, 187, No. 186]

51-55.....Publius Memmius Cleander [Dittenberger, *Syll.*², 808]

Our two additions to the list of epimeletae serve to fill the lacuna between Callistratos and Sesander. No one has yet attempted to determine the Pythian festival over which an epimeletes presided, whether his presidency of the games came in the first or the last year of office.² We must consider the evidence here, for the problem is of

¹ See Bourguet, *De rebus Delphicis*, pp. 48 ff.; Dittenberger, *Syll.*², 825, n. 3 (Pomtow).

² Pomtow is inconsistent on this point. In notes on Dittenberger, *op. cit.*, 822, he argues that a statue erected by Cyllus at the Pythian festival over which he presided is to be dated in 95, since Cyllus was in office for the Pythiad 91-95; but in commenting on the epimelesia of Petraeus (*ibid.*, 825, which he assigns to the years 103-7, he apparently thought that Petraeus was agonothetes in 103, the first year of his Pythiad.

importance to us. For example, if Antigonus was agonothetes in the last year of his term, the first victory of Tryphosa fell in the year 43.

Amphictyonic epimeletae, so far as they are known to me for the period following 55 A.D., are these (Pomtow's dates are in parentheses¹ my dates are those of the Pythian festivals over which I think the epimeletae presided; for this tabulation I assume that the epimeletes took charge of the games in his first year):

	55	
	59	
	63	
	67 (?)Ti. Claudius Cleomachus [Dittenberger, <i>Syll.</i> ² , 813]
	71	
(75-79)	75 (?)Ti. Claudius Celsus [<i>Klio</i> , XVII, 188]
	79	
(83-87)	83Callistratos, son of Leon ² [Bourguet, <i>op. cit.</i> , p. 55]
(87-91)	87T. Flavius Megalinus [<i>Syll.</i> ² , 813, 821 D]
(91-95)	91Cyllus, later T. Flavius [<i>ibid.</i> , 822]
(99-103)	95T. Flavius Soclarus [<i>ibid.</i> , 823]
(103-7)	99L. Cassius Petraeus ³ [<i>ibid.</i> , 825]
(107-11)	103L. Cassius Petraeus [<i>ibid.</i>]
(111-15)	107L. Mestrius Plutarchus [<i>ibid.</i> , 829, and n. 2, 823]
(115-19)	111L. Mestrius Plutarchus
(119-23)	115L. Mestrius Plutarchus
(123-27?)	119L. Mestrius Plutarchus
	123L. Mestrius Plutarchus
	[?]T. Flavius Eubiotus, son of Cyllus [<i>IG</i> , IX, 2, 44]

The chief difficulty with the chronology proposed by Pomtow is connected with the careers of two men, T. Flavius Soclarus and Mestrius Plutarch, the famous author. In brief, Pomtow places the epimelesia of Soclarus, a Tithoraeon by birth, in 99-103;⁴ Soclarus' Delphian archonship is placed in 98-99. By this means Pomtow arrived at an impossible situation involving two Achaian proconsuls, Herennius Saturninus and Caristianus Julianus. From imperial re-

¹ Cf. Bourguet, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff.

² Two of Plutarch's dialogues, *On the Cessation of Oracles* and *Sympos.* vii. 5, are probably to be dated in the year 83 because of references to Callistratus, the agonothetes.

³ For Petraeus the agonothetes see Plutarch *On the Pythian Responses* 29; *Sympos.* v. 2.

⁴ *Syll.*², 823. Pomtow admits the possibility of the Pythiad 95-99 for Soclarus, though he considers it less probable than 99-103.

scripts we know that Saturninus' proconsulship began before December 10, 98, and continued until November of the next year.¹ That of Caristanus is dated by month within the archonship of Soclarus, according to Pomtow in the spring of 99.²

In addition to overlapping proconsulships in this fashion, Pomtow reverses the normal order of events. Men like Soclarus who were not native Delphians were frequently honored with Delphian citizenship as a reward for having brought renown to the festivals over which they presided. After this grant of Delphian citizenship, they became eligible for election to the archonship of the city, not before. Thus one might expect to find that Soclarus' epimelesia antedates his archonship, and now that we know that Pomtow's date for the archonship is incorrect, we can reverse the order.

In the second place, it was customary for generous epimeletae to receive Roman citizenship. Soclarus, as his name T. Flavius shows, received this honor under the Flavians. Thus if we are right in connecting his citizenship with the epimelesia, the major part of his work, that which dealt with the Pythian festival, must have been performed under Domitian. We must then date the Pythian festival of Soclarus' presidency in 95, at the latest, and his epimelesia extended from 95 to 99.³

While much in the foregoing reconstruction is conjectural, it avoids a serious difficulty and it paves the way to a much more satisfactory revision of the rest of the list. Between Soclarus and Plutarch, for whom we have evidence in an inscription probably dating between 117 and 120,⁴ we must place the two terms of Petraeus, the first of

¹ Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 70; cf. Groag, *RE*, s.v. "Herennius 42."

² Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 28. Cf. Pomtow, note on *Syll.*², 823, who accepts Bourguet's date for this inscription. Homolle, *BCH*, XX, 721, was probably correct when he set as the limits of Soclarus' archonship the years 98 and 102. The exact year remains to be determined, and with it the year of Caristanus' proconsulship.

³ The functions of the Olympic Hellanodicae resembled those of the Amphictyonic epimeletes. They presided over the games and their chairman was the eponymous agonothetes. Like the epimeletae their office was for a four-year period, and, as we have assumed for Delphi, they superintended the Olympic games in their first year of office. Their term began ten months before the games. Possibly the epimeletes at Delphi began his term early enough to supervise the preparations for the games over which he was to preside.

⁴ *Syll.*², 829.

which is dated by the fact that Trajan was called Dacicus at some time during the term.¹ Thus he may well have been in office from 99 to 103, for Trajan assumed the name Dacicus in 102. From a dinner conversation at which Plutarch and the agonotheses Petraeus were present we learn that one of the topics of the day, one that had been debated in the Amphictyonic Assembly, was a change in the program of the contests. The majority had been in favor of discontinuing the literary contests, although Plutarch had spoken against the proposed reforms.²

Not long before, as one may infer from imperial rescripts of the reign of Domitian,³ a similar proposal to alter the program of the Pythian games had been carried in the assembly contrary to the wishes of Delphi. The Delphians had then appealed to the Emperor, and he seems to have decided in their favor. About ten years later, during the proconsulship of Herennius Saturninus, the Emperor again corresponded with Delphi, and a letter written in November 99 has been found.⁴ While the subject of this correspondence is not known it might very well have had its origin in the revival of the Amphictyonic proposal to change the Pythian program. If our date for Petraeus' epimelesia is correct, the Amphictyonic Council at the Pythian festival of 99 had determined upon curtailment. One wonders whether Plutarch's defense of the existing order may not have been instrumental in winning him favor at Delphi.

While we are discussing the epimelesia of Petraeus, it is pertinent to remark that the erection of statues to the emperors and other prominent men is not necessarily associated with the Pythian festival. For example, because Petraeus is named as epimeletes when a statue was erected to Trajan (Dacicus), it is not necessary to conclude that it was dedicated at the Pythian festival of 103. Statues were erected at any convenient time, as can be seen from an inscription accurately dated in a year when no festival was held.⁵ The danger of associating

¹ *Ibid.*, 825. This inscription, probably, though not necessarily, is to be assigned to the first term of Petraeus. See below.

² Plutarch *Sympos.* iii. 2.

⁴ Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

³ *Syll.*³, 821.

⁵ *Syll.*³, 808.

statues with Pythian festivals is to be seen in Pomtow's attempt to date the proconsulship of Avidius Quietus in the year 95.¹

Nor is it absolutely certain that the statue to Trajan was erected in the first term of Petraeus, simply because it does not state explicitly that Petraeus was epimeletes for the second time. There is an inscription erected by Plutarch when he was for the second time epimeletes, if we accept Pomtow's chronology, or in his third term, if our dates are correct, without any indication of the number of times Plutarch had held the office.²

The chronological advantages of our reconstruction of the epimeletae are fully apparent when we come to the career of Plutarch. He tells us in plain terms that he had held the epimelesia many Pythiads, *λειτουργοῦντα πολλάς Πυθιάδας*,³ but unfortunately we know neither the date when he wrote these words nor how soon afterward he died. Even the date of his death is unknown. "Many Pythiads" is interpreted by Pomtow to mean three, or possibly four, assuming that Plutarch lived beyond the year 123. But Pomtow's assumption that the epimeletes presided over the games in his last year of office gives to Plutarch only three liturgies, unless he wrote after 127; and Pomtow in another connection argued that in 125-26 Plutarch was either dead or on the point of dying.⁴ Certainly, if we are to conclude that Plutarch used the word *πολλάς* when he meant "three," his reputation for accuracy must suffer. Even as a substitute for the numeral "four," the word seems like an exaggeration.

Our table, however, gives to Plutarch five liturgies as agonothetes of the Pythian games up to and including the year 123. Beyond this point it is probably unnecessary to go.⁵ Our hypothesis is then justified by the conclusions we have reached.

¹ Cf. p. 5, n. 2. Pomtow dates the proconsulship of Quietus in 95 because his statue was erected when Cyllus was epimeletes. He also states that Quietus was *consul suffectus* in 94, a statement for which I have found no other authority. If it were true, it would prove that Quietus was not proconsul in 95, for Achaëa was a praetorian province. If the statue was actually erected at the time of the games, it must date in 91, but it seems better to leave the exact year *sub judice*.

² *Syll.*², 829.

³ *An seni sit ger. resp.* 17.

⁴ N. 2 on *Syll.*², 822.

⁵ Pomtow, when he first discussed the passage from Plutarch (*Jahrb. f. Phil.* [1889], p. 553), interpreted *πολλάς Πυθιάδας* just as I have done. His minimum was then five Pythiads. Except that the nature of the liturgies is now better understood, the Greek would seem to require the same interpretation as it did then. But at that time the problem was relatively simple, for it had not been complicated by the multitude of

It remains only to add that the agonothesia of Antigonus falls automatically in the year 39 and that of Cleomachidas four years later. Tryphosa, the elder sister, as one would expect, was about finishing her course when the second sister reached her prime, and the third sister follows the second after a short interval.

Before concluding with our inscription, I wish to point to the frequency with which non-Delphians were Amphictyonic epimeletae as corroboration of our conclusion that Antigonus was an Argive. We have listed thirteen epimeletae. Of these at least eight were by birth citizens of members of the league other than Delphi. They were Cleomachus and Celsus of Nicopolis, Sosander and Petraeus Hypataeans, Cyllus and Eubiotus of Thessaly, Soclarus a Tithoraeans, and Plutarch of Chaironea. To these names we can add Theocles (*ca.* 15-19) of Nicopolis, and Julius Autaphilus (Arnophilus ?) of Hypata.¹

Not all, however, of those to whom Pomtow has ascribed Delphian origin were Delphians. Publius Memmius Cleander was undoubtedly a Corinthian, one of the *duoviri quinquennales* at the time of Nero's visit in 67,² and the reason why Pomtow could find no relations for him among the Delphian Memmii is thus easily understood. Cleomachidas also had no Delphian relations, and from the similarity of names one may well conclude that he belonged to the Nicopolitan family from which came Ti. Claudius Cleomachus, epimeletes about twenty years later. Thus our list of Delphian epimeletae shrinks to Callistratus, son of Callistratus (33-39); Callistratus, son of Leon; and Megalinus. It is unnecessary to insist on Delphian origin for Antigonus, and Pomtow's attempt to identify him with a Delphian senator about forty years later is unnecessary. Antigonus the Delphian senator was not a Roman citizen, and the Argive Antigonus probably received citizenship under Claudius.

epigraphic evidence that has since accumulated. One serious difficulty with epigraphic texts is their apparent finality, and when they are in conflict with literary sources, as I have shown elsewhere in discussing Plutarch as a historical source (*TAPA*, LVII [1926], 60-70), the tendency is to reject everything in favor of the inscriptions. In many cases the usefulness of an inscription as evidence depends upon its interpretation, and when it seems to be at variance with literary evidence, one may reasonably question the validity of the interpretation before accepting it as final. But too often a faulty interpretation passes as epigraphic evidence.

¹ *Syll.*³, 791; *BCH*, XXI, 154.

² Fox, *JIAN*, II, 114 f., Nos. 58 f.

Antigonus was not the only one of our unenfranchised Greek agonothetae to receive this honor. As we have seen, Novius of Athens and Nicoteles of Epidaurus were Claudii before the end of the reign of Claudius; about Cleomachidas we are uncertain, but the fact that an epimeletes at Delphi by the name of Cleomachus about twenty years later was also Ti. Claudius shows that the family did not wait long for the distinction. About Menoetas nothing is known.

One does not need to search long for an explanation of the imperial generosity. The men whose careers are known were all connected with the imperial cult. Novius, for example, was twice agonothetes of Sebastea in Athens, priest of Antonia, priest of the house of the Augusti and of Nero.¹ Nicoteles dedicated statues to Claudius and Agrippina at Epidaurus.² He seems to have been a near relative of Cornelius Pulcher who was agonothetes on the Isthmus in 43, and the Corneli were active supporters of the imperial cult at Epidaurus. In the time of Augustus one of them established the Caesarea as an adjunct for the Asclapiea, and he was twice priest of Augustus Caesar. Later the Caesarea at Epidaurus were transformed into Sebastea, and one of their last-known agonothetae was another Cornelius Pulcher, held in high honor throughout the province, agonothetes and municipal official at Corinth, a friend of Plutarch, and an imperial official.³

Whether Nicoteles as agonothetes of the Asclapiea was also agonothetes of the Epidaurian Sebastea one cannot say, but it would not be surprising to find that the imperial games fell in the year of his presidency. We have suggested that the Sebastea at Argos were celebrated with the Nemea in the year when Antigonus presided, and I am now of the opinion⁴ that the imperial games on the Isthmus fell in the year 43 when Cornelius Pulcher presided. In fact, it is not

¹ *IG*, III, 457, 613, 652, 1085. Pomtow, n. 9 (*Syll.*, 802), has omitted an important inscription, 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. (1885), p. 207, No. 1, which shows that Novius had received citizenship before the death of Claudius. It dates from the same year as *IG*, III, 652. See also *JHS* (1896), p. 339; *BCH*, II, 400, No. 9; III, 160 f., Nos. 9, 10. Cf. Graindor, *Chronologie des Archontes athéniens sous l'Empire*, commenting upon *IG*, III, 158, 458; *Album d'Inscriptions attiques*, p. 62, n. 1.

² *IG*, IV, 1403.

³ For the Corneli Pulchri of Epidaurus, see *ibid.*, p. 264, and Nos. 795, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1600, 1601; Smith, *AJA*, XXVIII (1919), 382, No. 89; Powell, *ibid.*, VII (1903), 49 ff., Nos. 24-26; Plutarch Πῶς ἀν τις ἐπ' ἐχθρῶν ὠφελοῖτο 1.

⁴ The imperial games at Corinth will be discussed elsewhere.

improbable that the Sebastea in these three centers of national games¹ would be so spaced that they would fall in different years, as happened in Asia; and as it happens, the suggestions we have made would give us the following scheme:

43 Isthmian Sebastea

45 Asclapian Sebastea

44 Nemean Sebastea

46 Ptoan Sebastea [?]

Whether this be true or not, the group of wealthy Greeks under whom the three athletic sisters won their victories were representative of the spirit which later was to find expression in the life and writings of Plutarch. Had he lived earlier, doubtless he would have been a member of their circle; and as it was, his friendship with the younger Cornelius Pulcher brings it very close to us. Greece in the time of Claudius, we may infer, was socially very much as we see it through Plutarch's eyes. Public men from the chief cities of the province exchanged visits and courtesies, met at the great festivals over which they presided, and gave freely of their time and money to preserve and restore the ancient glories of Hellas, being inspired with, and bound together by, the feeling that the unity of Greece under Rome offered hope for the future. An indication of the Romanized nationalism of the period of our study was the union of various Hellenic *κοινά* which had just been formed with its seat at Argos, in which were active men like the Corneli of Epidauros and the Euryclid Julii from Sparta; from it sprang a new loyalty to the Empire and a new bond of union for Achaea.

CINCINNATI

¹ In Asia the *κοινά* of the province were held in each of the important provincial cities in turn, and a similar arrangement might be expected in Achaea. The three cities where games similar to the *κοινά* were held were all national centers, and each was intimately connected with the enlarged Achaean *κοινόν* which was in the process of formation at the time of Caligula's accession (*IG*, VII, 1711). Argos was the meeting place of the league; Corinth was the capital of the province; Epidauros provided several important officials. One wonders whether the fourth celebration may not have been an adjunct of the revived Ptoan games, thereby giving Central Greece a share in the cult. It is noteworthy that neither Olympia nor Delphi had imperial games. It may be significant that Caesarea already existed at Corinth, Nemea, and Epidauros before the enlarged Achaean *κοινόν* was created.

THE HEADINGS OF RESCRIPTS OF THE SEVERI IN THE JUSTINIAN CODE

By C. E. VAN SICKLE

ONE of the most intriguing of all the available sources for the study of Roman history is to be found in the headings and date formulas of the rescripts included in the Justinian Code. As the former profess to give the names and rank (whether Caesar or Augustus) of the persons issuing them, and the latter the exact dates of issuance, and as for many reigns they average better than one per month, they would if genuine aid in the solution of many a chronological and constitutional problem. Unfortunately, it is evident that they are far from being entirely correct. Not only is their testimony contradicted by literary sources, coins, inscriptions, and papyri; but in many cases they do not even agree with one another. As a consequence, the student is confronted with the problem of determining to what degree the information which they furnish is historically reliable, and what are the causes of such errors as are known to exist. This study will be confined to an analysis of the headings and date formulas of the rescripts issued by Septimius Severus and the members of his dynasty.

The name of Septimius Severus appears on one hundred and ninety-one rescripts. Of these, twenty-eight are without dates, and the remainder are dated between June, 193, and November, 215. The earliest of these bears the date June 27, 193. From Dio (lxxiii. 17), Herodian (ii. 12), and the *Historia Augusta* (Capitolinus *Pertinax* xxv. 6 and Spartian *Didius Julianus* ix. 3) we know that Severus was recognized in Rome on June 1, 193. The date, therefore, is presumably correct; and there is no conclusive evidence against the authenticity of any of the other dates up to 211, the time of Severus' death. This, of course, does not mean that there are no mistaken dates in these rescripts; but rather that there is no means of checking and proving the errors where they exist. It is far different with the headings. Those of 193-96, all with one exception (iv. 14. 1, dated November 28, 196), read: "Impp. Severus et Antoninus AA." (iii. 28. 1; viii. 13. 1;

ii. 1. 2; ii. 23. 1; etc.). Now Caracalla was not made Caesar until some time in 196.¹ The same heading is attached to all rescripts of 197, though in that year Caracalla was only Caesar.² The rescripts of 198–211 would properly bear the names of both emperors; but though most of them conform to this rule, there are several exceptions. ii. 3. 1 is dated November 25, 200; but it bears the name of Severus alone; while vi. 28. 1 (dated June 26, 204) has in two manuscripts the heading: "Imp. Antoninus A.," and in a third "Imp. Severus et Antoninus AA.," and ii. 11. 7–10 (dated in 205 and 208), all bear the name of Caracalla alone, without any variant manuscript readings.³ Although Geta, the younger son of Severus, was Augustus from 209 to 212, his name does not appear in any headings of rescripts of those years. On the other hand, though Severus died on February 4, 211,⁴ his name appears along with that of Caracalla in nine rescripts of later date (vi. 37. 3; iii. 32. 2; iv. 5. 1; iv. 5. 2; v. 23. 1; iii. 13. 1; v. 6. 1; vi. 54. 4; and vii. 2. 4), the latest being dated November 25, 215; and vii. 12. 1, presumably a rescript of Severus and Caracalla, is dated June 16, 161! It is obvious from these facts that the historical student can hardly hope to use the rescripts of Severus and Caracalla to much advantage. The errors in question may conceivably be due to one of three agencies: (1) changes made by contemporaries of the issuers, which would most often take the form of *damnationes memoriae*; (2) errors of copyists, either before or after the compilation of the Code, and (3) the activities of editors, whether the compilers of the Justinian Code or of the Codex Gregorianus, from which these earlier rescripts have been drawn.

The presence of Caracalla's name with the title of Augustus in headings of rescripts of the years 193–97 is too common and too widely scattered through the Code to admit of its being the result of a copyist's error subsequent to the compilation of the Code. In fact, it is much more probable that the one datable exception to this rule was itself the result of a copyist's error. It was likewise not the work of contemporaries of the issuers. Had anything of the kind been done,

¹ Spartian *Severus* x. 3; Hasebroek, *Kaiser Septimius Severus*, pp. 81–83, etc.

² Cod. Just. ii. 11. 2; ii. 18. 2; viii. 17. 1; v. 25. 4; v. 47. 1, etc.

³ Krueger, *Corpus Iuris Civilis* (6th stereotyped ed.), II, 489.

⁴ Dio lxxvii. 15.

Caracalla himself would have been the logical person to suspect of having tampered with the rescripts of his father's reign; and his officials would have found it advisable to use the form prescribed by him in their citations of such documents. This we do not find to have been the case. Ulpian, whose work was begun under Caracalla, and who speaks of Caracalla as "Imperator noster Antoninus" (*Dig.* xxiv. 1. 3. 2), constantly makes a distinction between rescripts of Severus alone and those issued by both father and son. Thus among the excerpts from his work preserved in the *Digest* we find the following: "Et est Graecum Severi rescriptum" (*ibid.* xv. 1. 2. 3), "Imp. Severus" (*ibid.* xvii. 2. 1 and 9. 1. 2; xviii. 2. 16), and "Divus Severus" (xxiii. 3. 40; xxiii. 4. 11; xxvi. 10. 1. 7; xxvii. 3. 1. 3; xlviii. 18. 1. 17; xlviii. 18. 9; xlviii. 19. 8. 5; l. 13. 1. 13; l. 15. 1. 7, etc.); but, on the other hand, "Imperatores Severus et Antoninus" (i. 15. 4; x. 2. 18; xxvii. 3. 17, etc.), "Imperator Noster cum Divo Patre suo" (xxiv. 1. 7. 5; l. 13. 1. 10; l. 13. 1. 12, etc.), and kindred expressions. While most of these allusions are to acts that cannot be dated, several of them are either dated or contain matter that permits us to date them approximately. Thus *ibid.* xxvii. 9. 1, which bears the name of Severus alone, was issued June 13, 195 (a year before the elevation of Caracalla to the rank of Caesar); and l. 15. 1, which contains a list of cities which enjoyed the *Ius Italicum* and other privileges, names Severus alone as the grantor in the cases of Baalbec, Laodicea, and Sebaste—cities which profited by their espousal of the side of Severus in his war with Pescennius Niger (193–94). Such a grant would naturally be made during Severus' first stay in the East, which preceded the elevation of Caracalla to Caesarship.¹ Small, therefore, as is the proportion of datable rescripts of Severus mentioned by Ulpian, they go to show that in his day (he was killed during the reign of Alexander Severus) Caracalla's name had not yet been inserted into the headings of rescripts of the first three years of his father's reign.

This assumption is further strengthened by a study of the extant portions of Modestinus, who wrote under Alexander Severus. Thus in *Dig.* xxvi. 6. 2. 2; xxvii. 1. 2. 6; and xxvii. 1. 10. 6 he refers to rescripts of Severus alone, and in *ibid.* xxvii. 1. 2. 8–9; xxvii. 1. 4. 1; xxvii. 1. 6. 11; xxvii. 1. 13. 1; and xlix. 16. 3 he cites those of Severus and Caracal-

¹ Spartian *op. cit.* x. 1–3.

la. As late, therefore, as the reign of Alexander Severus the headings of rescripts of Septimius Severus were still correctly preserved.

We may next ask whether the editors who worked under Justinian's direction made the change referred to. The Emperor's commission gave them authority to make whatever verbal changes they thought necessary; but we need not assume that such changes as were made had anything to do with the phraseology of the headings. Had anything of the kind been attempted, the editors would almost certainly have tried to bring the practice of the *Digest* into harmony with that of the Code; and their failure to do so shows that they did not intentionally change the headings in either case. The change, therefore, was made between the reign of Alexander Severus and that of Justinian. Can we date it more nearly?

The source of the earlier rescripts of the Code was, as Justinian himself assures us in the preamble, the Codex Gregorianus, which was compiled under Diocletian.¹ If Justinian's jurists did not themselves insert the name of Caracalla into the headings of the rescripts in question, they must have copied these in substantially their present form from the Codex Gregorianus. The surviving fragments of that collection contain but one rescript of Severus' reign earlier than 198,² and it bears the name of Severus alone; but it is not preserved in the Justinian Code, hence we cannot make any comparisons. Although this one example does not bear out the theory that rescripts of 193-98 in the Codex Gregorianus regularly bore the heading, "Impp. Severus et Antoninus AA.," we can hardly form our opinion of the regular practice from it alone. As we have seen, several exceptions to the rule occur in the Justinian Code itself, and the surviving example from the earlier collection may be just such a case. There is therefore some evidence in favor of the view that the maker of the Codex Gregorianus was responsible for the change in question; but the evidence at hand permits no dogmatic conclusions.

Severus seems to have issued public papers in his own name alone up to the latter part of 196.³ Egyptian documents of 197, on the other hand, contain the names of Severus and Caracalla, giving the latter

¹ Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 162 ff.

² Cod. Greg. ii. 1. 1.

³ Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, Nos. 27 and 29; *Gr. Ostr.*, No. 975.

the title of Caesar.¹ It seems that the date formulas of Egyptian documents were modeled after the headings of official proclamations; and so the use of Caracalla's name in the date formulas would indicate that in 197 it was also placed in such headings. Even more significant are some of the linguistic peculiarities in the bodies of rescripts of 196-97. While the so-called "plural of majesty" was not unknown in Latin literature generally, it was not used in imperial documents written in Latin up to the time of the Severi. Augustus,² Vespasian,³ Domitian,⁴ and Commodus,⁵ not to mention others, use the singular number in referring to themselves; and in the Code itself rescripts of Caracalla⁶ and of Alexander Severus⁷ indicate that the same practice was followed by the successors of Severus. If, then, we find references in any rescript of this period to its maker in which the singular number is used, it seems fair to assume that there was only one emperor at the time of its making, and that conversely the use of the plural number would indicate that there was more than one emperor at the time of its making. Cod. Just. v. 4. 3, which bears the date November 13, 196, has the heading "Imp. Severus et Antoninus AA.," but contains the expression *temporum meorum*. This would point to the existence of but one emperor at the time of its issuance. But *ibid.* iii. 26. 1 (April 25, 197) contains the word *nostros*; and iii. 28. 3 (June 24, 197), the plural verb *censemus*. Putting these bits of evidence together, we have some ground for believing that Caracalla's name was not included in the headings of rescripts as late as November 13, 196, but that between that date and April 25, 197, he was allowed to participate in the law-making power, with the title of Caesar.

The absence of Severus' name from certain rescripts of 204, 205, and 208, and its inclusion in certain others of 211, 213, 214, and 215, can best be considered together. The presence of a variant reading in vi. 28. 1 (as mentioned above) supports the view that a late copyist's negligence is responsible for such errors. This, however, can hardly have been the case. No other variant readings occur in this group—a thing which we might expect to find in the event of copyists'

¹ P. Oxy., VI, 910.

² *Ibid.*, II, 1423; X, 8038.

³ *CIL*, III, 769 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IX, 5420.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII, 10570; III, 13750.

⁶ Cod. Just. ii. 46. 1; ii. 53. 1; viii. 43. 1; viii. 50. 1; etc.

⁷ *Ibid.* vii. 62. 2; viii. 45. 1; ix. 8. 1; x. 5. 1, etc.

mistakes. Also, another solution suggests itself, which will account for at least part of them. Cod. Just. iii. 13. 1 (January 11, 214) is headed: "Impp. Severus et Antoninus AA." It also contains the expression *Procurator noster*. Since these words imply that the rescript was the work of two emperors, it seems reasonable in this case to assume that the heading is correct and the date wrong. In no other part of this group do we find any references to the makers; but there are probably others which owe their form to the same process. The compilers of the Code seem not infrequently to have combined two or more rescripts in order to secure a form suited to their purposes.¹ It is probable that in some cases of this kind they left the heading of one of the original rescripts upon the hybrid product with the date formula of another. Such a process cannot, of course, be satisfactorily proved at the present day; hence this explanation must remain a hypothesis, though an attractive and probable one. Copyists' errors and combinations of different rescripts will probably account for most if not all of the cases of these two classes.

Cod. Just. vii. 12. 1, which combines a heading of Severus and Caracalla with the date June 16, 161, and which in addition contains the words *pater meus*, shows the tendency to combine and condense earlier literature at what for the student of history must appear its worst. It is possible that we have here portions of three decisions blended into one, and that each of the three points mentioned above comes from a different source. Again, *Digest* xlviii. 19. 33 indicates that Marcus Aurelius and Verus actually legislated upon the subject which it treats; hence the date may be correct and the heading wrong. Probably a part of some one of the decisions of Severus and Caracalla also entered into it, along with the heading; or it may have been one of Severus alone, and published in the year 195, after he had proclaimed his descent from the Antonines. Any explanation of this strange phenomenon must remain largely guesswork; but there are several possible combinations which would serve to explain it satisfactorily.

The complete absence of Geta's name from the headings of the Code is easily explained as the result of the fierce hatred with which Caracalla pursued the memory of his murdered brother. Every stu-

¹ Preamble to Code, Part II, ll. 10 and 11.

dent of Latin epigraphy knows how thoroughly the name of the unfortunate prince was deleted from inscriptions. An Egyptian papyrus of 210¹ is dated by Severus, Caracalla, and Geta; but the name of Geta shows signs of having later been erased. This indicates a tendency to carry out this *damnatio memoriae* in official documents; and we must assume that care would be taken to accomplish this purpose in the case of papers in the imperial archives. None of the jurists cited in the *Digest* so much as mentions Geta, though because of the large number of decisions of the Severi cited some of these must have been issued during the years 209–12. It seems fairly certain, therefore, that Geta's name was erased by order of Caracalla, at the same time that it was being deleted from the inscriptions and papyri.

In the cases of Cod. Just. ix. 1. 3 (February 3, 222) and iv. 44. 1 (February 19, 222), where Alexander's name appears alone in the headings, it appears very probable that that of Elagabalus originally appeared in company with it. Elagabalus was killed in March, 222;² and the absence of his name from rescripts of February, 222, requires some explanation. It is noteworthy that although Alexander and Elagabalus were colleagues in the consulship for 222, only the former's name appears in the date formulas of rescripts of that year. That Elagabalus suffered a *damnatio memoriae* after his death is the testimony of Lampridius;³ and the proof of this is to be seen in the erasure of his name from the consular fasti. There seems no doubt that the same process was carried out in the headings where it appeared at the same time.

The evidence adduced above would seem to point to the following conclusions:

1. That the insertion of Caracalla's name in headings of his father's rescripts was unwarranted before about the beginning of 197, but legal thereafter.

2. That the insertion of Caracalla's name into the headings of rescripts of 193–96, and his title of Augustus for 197, was not the result of any alteration of the documents by him or during his reign, but was accomplished between the death of Alexander Severus and the compilation of the Justinian Code—probably by the compiler of the Codex Gregorianus.

¹ P. Oxy. vii. 1039.

² Dio lxxviii. 39. etc.

³ *Heliogabalus* xvii. 4.

3. That the omission of Severus' name from some headings of 204, 205, and 208 and its inclusion in several of 211, 213, 214, and 215 are in part the results of late copyists' errors, and in part of a tendency on the part of the compilers to combine portions of different rescripts, using in each case the heading of one with the date formula of another.

4. That the absence of the names of Geta and Elagabalus from headings of the Code was the result of contemporary *damnationes memoriae*.

5. That for the student of history the headings of rescripts of the Severi in the Justinian Code are of very little value.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

1849-1928

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE died after a brief illness on June 23, 1928, at his home in Shippan Point, Stamford, Connecticut. A peaceful end of a long and distinguished career of a full life rich in human relations and achievement.

Mr. Hale was born in Savannah, Georgia, in 1849, of New England revolutionary stock, his parents' home being in Peterboro, New Hampshire, where he spent his boyhood. He attended Phillips-Exeter Academy and Harvard College, where he graduated in 1870. Between 1870 and 1880 he was fellow at Harvard, student in Leipzig and Göttingen, and tutor in Latin at Harvard, professor of Latin at Cornell, 1880-92, professor and head of the department of Latin in the University of Chicago from 1892 till his retirement in 1919, first chairman of the Managing Committee and first director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, 1895-96, chairman of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, president of the American Philological Association, 1892-93, author of *The Art of Reading Latin*, 1887, *The Cum Constructions*, 1887-88, *The Sequence of Tenses in Latin*, 1894, the *Hale-Buck Latin Grammar*, 1903, *First Latin Book*, 1907, and numerous journal articles. He received the honorary degree of LL.D. from Union, Princeton, St. Andrews, and Aberdeen.

Such a bare recital gives no idea of Mr. Hale's influence as scholar, teacher, and organizer. His first publication, *The Art of Reading Latin*, became the best-known guide for reading Latin with accuracy and taste. Practical problems of teaching, of teaching that should at the same time be simpler and more in accord with scientific analysis, were his concern in his devoted labors as chairman of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature and in his textbooks. His Teachers' Training Course at Chicago was thronged with actual and prospective teachers of Latin.

He was equally well known to the scholars of Europe and America for his *Cum Constructions*, which appeared in a German translation, and other studies in Latin syntax. It is not too much to say that no

other scholar, anywhere, combined in equal degree an intimate first-hand knowledge of the facts of Latin usage with a mastery of the historical-comparative method. He often expressed his indebtedness to Delbrück, but he was able to carry the latter's method farther in its application to Latin and to reach new results.

As chairman of the Managing Committee in the critical years of organization, and as the first director, Mr. Hale was virtually the founder of the American School of Classical Studies at Rome. It was during the year of his directorship that he discovered in the Vatican Library a previously unknown manuscript of Catullus, which proved to be one of the most important, and which led to an exhaustive study of the interrelations of the Catullus manuscripts. This became his dominant interest, and he devoted himself to a projected work, perhaps the most elaborate in completeness and refinement of method ever undertaken in the field of textual criticism. Unfortunately this remained unfinished and must be carried on, in some form, by others.

Mr. Hale was one of the first chosen by President Harper to serve as "Head of the Department," one of that distinguished group which was to give the new university an immediate standing in the scholarly world, and upon which the president relied to build up strong departments. Mr. Hale entered upon this adventure (for so it must have seemed to him and to others who left ranking positions in the older universities) with whole-hearted enthusiasm. He was one of the most active in the faculty deliberations, a leader and not only on the "Latin question." In his own department he was never content with the initial prestige which his own presence gave to it. He developed a department of Latin of notable strength not merely by his judgment in selecting new men, but above all by his encouragement and stimulation of the members of the staff. He was ambitious for them, that they should be masters too, the stronger, the better each in some special branch of Latin studies. His desire for a well-rounded department was a spurring influence and successful in the issue.

All who knew Mr. Hale will think of his distinguished presence, his personal charm and unfailing courtesy. If ever one feels moved to repeat a hackneyed phrase, it is to apply it in all its serious import to such a man as was Mr. Hale—a gentleman and a scholar.

C. D. B.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE ARISTOTELIAN *PROTREPTICUS* AND THE DEVELOPMENTAL TREATMENT OF THE ARISTOTELIAN ETHICS

This comparison between Herr Gadamer's paper on this subject in the April, 1928, number of *Hermes*, and some portions of my doctoral dissertation ("The Relation of the *Eudemian* to the *Nicomachean Ethics* of Aristotle"), submitted at the University of Chicago in September, 1926, has been prepared at the request of Professor Shorey; it may perhaps be of interest to have some further material on the subject presented, in connection with Herr Gadamer's article, in a form more accessible than a typed dissertation and fuller than the published abstract.

Of the three main points in Jaeger's¹ interpretation of the *Protrepticus*, which Herr Gadamer (p. 146) selects for discussion, two correspond to sections in the first part of my thesis²—vi, "*Φρόνησις*" (pp. 37-45), and ii, "Mathematical Ethics" (pp. 14-28); while the third, concerning the presence of the doctrine of ideas in the *Protrepticus*, is partly covered in viii (b) (pp. 49-52). Later Herr Gadamer also touches directly on the *Eudemian Ethics*.

Herr Gadamer's argument in regard to the use of *φρόνησις* is that one cannot prove, by the use in a given passage of this word in a sense more general than that of Aristotle's definition in *E.N.* vi, that the passage refers definitely to the theory of ideas (pp. 147 f.), since (a) *φρονεῖν* has a very general meaning in poetical as well as philosophical language, and its use may have become stereotyped in the protreptic context before Aristotle, in separating ethics from metaphysics, was led to define *φρ.* as *practical wisdom*; and since (b) Aristotle does not use his scientific terminology consistently or exclusively. For (b), to supplement Herr Gadamer's half-dozen references, I add a classification of the uses of the word in Plato and in Aristotle condensed from footnote 47:

φρ. has a definite transcendental color in *Phaed.* 79 D, 68 A, 69 B, *Tim.* 90 B; has no reference to the ideas, "the truly existent, etc.," in the *Philebus* (where *ἡ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι δύναμις* is the faculty whose object is the ideas) or in *Ll* 645 E, 665 D, *Rep.* 432 A, 461 A, *Euthyd.* 306 D, *Ll* 688 E, 886 B, *Protag.* 352 C, *Meno* 88 B; it takes the place of *σοφία* among the cardinal virtues in *Ll* 631 C, 963 C, *Rep.* 433 B, *Soph.* 247 A, B; and has only a stronger ethical connotation in *Rep.* 621 *ad fin.* and 571 C, and *Ll* 906 B. Other examples could be added.

¹ In *Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* (Berlin, 1923).

² To which I shall refer as "diss." by the pages of the typed copies in the Library of the University of Chicago. Part I is meant unless otherwise stated.

In Aristotle the distinction characteristic of *E.N.* vi is absent from *Met.* i. 982 b 24 (cf. i. 20); *ibid.* iii. 1009 b 13, viii. 1078 b 15; *de Coel.* iii. 298 b 28; *de Sensu* 437 a 1, 3; *Top.* 163 b 9; *de Gen. Anim.* 731 a 35, 753 a 12. (Of these Jaeger considers the biological works; [see pp. 352 ff.], *Met.* iii [p. 21], and *Met.* viii [p. 216 ff.], comparatively late). Some other cases need a discussion which it would be out of place to repeat here.

Herr Gadamer, while he notices that the wide sense of $\phi\phi$ occurs in the *Protrepticus*, and discusses, à propos of Jaeger (p. 84), the passage in *E.N.* where Aristotle concedes $\phi\phi$ to animals (1141 a 27), does not apparently notice the parallel to this passage in *Protr.* 36, 9 Pist., which reduces Jaeger's argument to an absurdity.

As regards the significance of the use of the word in *E.E.*, Herr Gadamer thinks it "still mysterious" (p. 163); it would take too much space to summarize here my attempt at a solution, but I feel confident that the argument from this word actually weighs *against* Jaeger's theory instead of for it.

The question whether the *Protrepticus* shows a similarity to Plato in positing an exact science of ethics falls naturally into two parts—first, What is the meaning of the chapter on method in the *Protrepticus* (chap. x) and especially of the passage (p. 55, l. 1. Pist.) in which Jaeger (p. 86 f.) sees ethics described as a science whose investigations are governed by "absolute norms" ($\delta\phi\phi$)? and second, Is there any such thing as "das platonische Methoden ideal einer Ethik *more geometrico*" (Jaeger, p. 87)?

On the former point, Herr Gadamer¹ (p. 151) criticizes Jaeger's interpretation of the passage on somewhat of the same lines (though in less detail) as had my dissertation (diss., pp. 15–16, on the passages in *E.N.* thought by Jaeger to be in strong contradiction to the *Protrepticus* passage; and pp. 21–22 on *Iambl.*, *Protr.* 55, 1–14 Pist. with its context) and with the same result, namely, that *E.N.* A 7 has no direct polemical reference to this passage of the *Protrepticus*. Herr Gadamer also notes (p. 152) the *resemblance* between the *Protrepticus* and *E.N.* x. 10 (1180 b 13 ff.) (cf. diss., p. 22, n. 19), and recognizes that this and *Pol.* 1288 b 40 are not inconsistent with the position of the *Protrepticus*. Instead, however, of correcting Jaeger's interpretation of the *E.N.* passages, or distinguishing the question of *method* in ethics and politics from that of the relative value of practical and theoretical training, confused by Jaeger (diss., pp. 16, 18), Herr Gadamer grants (p. 152; cf. 150–51) that, while there is no direct contradiction, the *differences* between the *Protrepticus* and the later doctrine of Aristotle are enough to be significant for the history of his development. He therefore confines his serious attack on Jaeger's conclusions to the second angle of the question.

"Allein, fragen wir [p. 153] welcher Plato ist es, in dessen Richtung diese Protreptikos-Zeugnisse zu liegen scheinen?" Herr Gadamer argues that the

¹ With the point that a protreptic to philosophy is not an introduction to the study of ethics (pp. 150–151) cf. diss., p. 22, n. 19.

emphasis on "measure" is characteristic of passages (he discusses the *Politicus* and the *Philebus*) where Plato is concerned with having knowledge brought into operation upon concrete facts ("the world of appearances"), and asks whether it is likely that the young Aristotle, if giving a deliberate statement of his position in regard to scientific method, would betray no consciousness of a problem so seriously occupying his master's attention (pp. 154-55). Hence, this is another instance for Herr Gadamer's chief thesis—that one should not look for statements of any particular philosophical position in a protrepticus. This line of argument is at least less obvious and simple¹ than to point out (cf. diss., pp. 17 f.) that Plato's emphasis on "measure" has nothing to do with exact *method of proof*, but is partly his way of expressing his intense disapproval of "pleasure," the desire for which is unlimited, and partly refers to the clearness, accuracy, and trueness of the *objects* of dialectic (and, in comparison with other sciences, of mathematics); while the *Politicus* passage is not, any more than the *Philebus*, to be taken literally or used as evidence of mathematically exact ethics.

The question of the presence of the Platonic doctrine of ideas in the *Protrepticus*, discussed by Herr Gadamer on pages 155-59, is attacked in my thesis from an entirely different angle—by a demonstration (pp. 49 ff.) that no distinction can be drawn between *ὅρος* as referring to an absolute norm and *σκοπὸς* and *τέλος* as temporary and particular ends (Jaeger, pp. 251-52; 252, n. 1), and that *ὅρος* in this use is *not* a characteristically Platonic word. I have repeatedly assumed, however, what is Herr Gadamer's main contention here: that the use of Platonic phraseology does not necessarily imply agreement with Platonic doctrine (see diss., p. 31 n. 37, pp. 45, 71; and Part II, Summary, p. 166).

Herr Gadamer touches on my central interest, the position of the *E.E.* in the problem, on pages 160 ff. His first point is the examination of chap. vi of *E.E. A.*, to find whether this chapter contains any *original* position essentially different from that of the method passages in *E.N.* Here Herr Gadamer's argument might almost be a (very brief) epitome of mine (diss., pp. 26-28, and Part II, pp. 93-95), with the same conclusion: that the only difference is in emphasis and can be explained on the hypothesis that the Eudemian chapter is a scholar's revision of and commentary on the *E.N.* passages, using material from Aristotle's other works.

This view Herr Gadamer (p. 161) finds confirmed by a comparison of the analyses of virtues in *E.E.* and *E.N.*, respectively, which, again, shows the *E.E.* to be fond of "formale Schärfe, antithetische Formulierung, Schematisierung" (p. 162); for examples of this and similar tendencies, see my disserta-

¹ The sentences (p. 153) "Nun ist es bedeutsam, dass dieser Gedanke der Messkunst bei Plato in der Tendenz auf wissenschaftliche Bewältigung des Bereichs des Werdens zur Ausbildung kann. Der Parallelbegriff zu dem der Messung ist der der Mischung" seem to me to contain a weak link of the argument.

tion as cited in footnotes 400, 401, 402, 411, 419, in the summary to the second part (cf. also, the abstract on Part II). My conclusion, based on a close analysis of a large fraction of the *E.E.* is exactly that tentatively hinted by Herr Gadamer—that the *E.E.* was written by a disciple of Aristotle.

Jaeger's theory that the phrase *ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι*, refers to the *Protrepticus* and similar early literary works of Aristotle (Gadamer, pp. 162–63) is the subject of my Sec. XI of Part I (pp. 71–74), and of pages 30–37. Points in which my arguments resemble Herr Gadamer's are: (a) an objection to supposing two different works included under one vague formula of reference,¹ and (b) the suggestion that Eudemus might as easily as Aristotle himself have used Aristotle's *Protrepticus* (with Gadamer, p. 163, cf. diss., pp. 35–37, for a somewhat elaborate argument that this is just what has occurred in regard to the Sardanapallus-reference of *E.E.* i. 5 (1215 b 15–1216 a 5)).

Besides the question of the use of *φρόνησις* in *E.E.* (see above), Herr Gadamer raises, without attempting to solve, two other problems: those of the "theonomen Aspekt" of the *E.E.*, and of its peculiar composition and strange transitions. The former I have tried (in sec. ix, pp. 58–70) to explain as an element deliberately added by Eudemus to the psychological and metaphysical sanctions which he found set forth or suggested in the *E.N.*—an element which, in spite of superficial resemblances of tone, is *not* Platonic,² but which, on the contrary, presupposes and fuses doctrines of the *Met.* and *de An.* never combined by Aristotle. In Part II, I have suggested explanations for some of the difficulties of order and transition which occur in the part of *E.E.* covered by my analysis (see below).

Finally, it is most refreshing to find Herr Gadamer recognizing (p. 163) that the proper method of attacking the question of the *E.E.*'s genuineness is to examine it closely in relation to the *E.N.*; and (p. 164) that Jaeger's book demands a new interpretation of the *E.E.* in the light of the whole of both Platonic and late-Aristotelian ethics.

Some contribution to the latter may be found in the first part of my thesis (which will perhaps be published within the year), especially in sections ii (on "Mathematical Ethics"), vi (on "*Φρόνησις*"), viii ([a] "The Perception of the Right Norm," [b] "*ἄρος* and *σκοπός*," [c] "A Definite Norm in *E.N.*") and ix ("The Norm of *E.E.*"). The second part is composed of an extremely detailed analysis, with constant reference to the *E.N.* and other works of Aristotle, of *E.E.* I–II. i. 18; II. i. 19–II. v, and III. i.—about a third

¹ G., p. 163, against J.'s referring *ἐξ. λογ.* in A8 to a critique of the idea-doctrine and in B1 to the *Protrepticus*; diss., p. 74, against his referring *ἐν τῷ λόγῳ* in 1218 a 36 to the *περὶ φιλοσοφίας* and in 1244b 34 to the *Protrepticus*.

² The effect is rather, as Herr Gadamer well suggests at the close of his article (not in this particular connection), neo-Platonic: "Ausdruck jenes Absinkens von der Höhe der aristotelischen Position und Opposition gegen Plato, durch das der Fortgang der griechischen Ethik in der Folgezeit charakterisiert ist."

of the *E.E.* exclusive of the common books.¹ This analysis, though incomplete and unfinished, has already yielded some interesting results,² and I still hope to continue it at some not too distant date.

MARY C. NEEDLER

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

SACRED CHICKENS IN RABBINIC LITERATURE

The story of Claudius Pulcher drowning the sacred chickens he had with him on a foreign expedition, so that they might at least drink if they would not eat, is familiar from Suetonius *Tiberius* ii. 2 and Cicero *De natura deorum* ii. 3. 7. Many passages, chiefly from Livy and the Elder Pliny,³ make it clear that it was a regular practice for generals to take the sacred chickens with them on their campaigns for purposes of augury. That the practice continued into imperial times is indicated by an interesting Midrashic parallel, slightly corrupted in transmission, which is reminiscent of the Claudius story. The parable is cited in the name of Resh Lakish, a Palestinian Amora of the second century. Versions are found in various Midrashic works, of which I translate first the earliest passage, *Leviticus Rabbah* xxvi. 7:

Resh Lakish said: It is like unto a king who went into a province and decreed, saying, Let all the chickens in this place be slaughtered. *At night he sought to go out. He said, Is there a cock here, that he may call?* They said to him, Is it not thyself who decreed, saying, Let every cock that is in this place be slain? So had Saul put away those that had familiar spirits and the wizards out of the land (I Samuel 28. 2), and he himself said, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit (I Samuel 28. 7).

Obviously the Roman Emperor did not require cocks to arouse his army. They were surely the sacred chickens that he called for, which he, like Claudius, had had killed in a fit of anger. Unless one thinks of a *tripudium* the comparison to the witch of Endor is meaningless.

The text of the portion in italics is as follows: בלילה בקש לצאת אמר *למלחמה*, לצאת שיקרא. יש כאן חרנגול שיקרא. Following *לצאת* is to be supplied; the expression regularly signifies *bellum inferre*. שיקרא is a gloss; some expression signifying "to practice augury" or perhaps "to feed," which would seem ridiculous to a copyist, has fallen out.

It is interesting to observe how the misunderstanding in regard to the purpose of the chickens was amplified. To this end I translate *Midrash Tanhuma*, Parashah Emor, *ab init.*:

¹ Other important passages are covered from a different point of view, but in equal detail, in Part I.

² See Abstract, Part II (*Abstracts of Theses, The University of Chicago, Humanistic Series*, Vol. V [1926-27]).

³ Cited, e.g., in Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², p. 532.

"Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and enquire of her." Resh Lakish said, A parable: Unto what is Saul like? Unto a king that entered a province. The king said, Let all the chickens that are in this place be slaughtered. *At night he desired to go upon his way in the morning. He said, There is no cock here to call?* They said to him, Art thou not he who commanded to slay them? So Saul put away the wizards and familiar spirits, and then said, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit.

The text italicized here reads: בלילה בקש לצאת לדרך בבקר אמר. אין כאן חריגול שיקרא. The two words לדרך בבקר are obviously a gloss, in view of the true meaning of the passage; "to go upon his way in the morning" cannot justify the general's keeping chickens or being compared to the witch of Endor.

MOSES HADAS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE PATHOS AND HUMOR OF αὖ

It is arguable that the Greek particles have little significance in themselves and that the meanings which we read into them are derived from the context and the association of ideas. This, perhaps, proves too much, for it applies equally to much of the meaning of all words, which is why Esperanto is "Desperanto," and the volatile essence of literature always escapes the test tube of literal-minded scientific analysis. What is the meaning of *deh* to one who looks it up for the first time in an Italian lexicon and to one in whose memory it has long been associated with Michelangelo's "Deh! parla basso," and Dante's "Deh! peregrini, che pensosi andate," and Turgeniev's quotation thereof?

The Greek particles may have been primitively little more than ejaculations, expletives, confirmations—"conversations' burrs," in short. And yet by specialization of function they may take to themselves meanings which inseparable association makes as much a part of themselves as their conjectural etymologies. The lexicon informs us that αὖ is an adverb of repeated action, meaning "again, once more, further, on the other hand, in turn," and, in a question, sometimes expressing impatience. But there are many shades of feeling which the ordinary student would not appreciate from this summary.

One of them is the pathetic use of αὖ to mark the passage and succession of the generations in our transitory life. Like most things this begins with Homer. In *Odyssey* iii. 410-11, Nestor comes forth from his chamber in the morning and sits on the polished stone where his father Neleus sat before him.

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἦδη καὶ δαμῆς Ἀϊδόςδε βεβήκει,
Νέστωρ αὖ τὸν ἔφύγε Γερήνιος οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν,

In Pindar's fourth Pythian, 143 ff., Jason tells Pelias: "one heifer was mother to Cretheus and bold Salomoneus and in the third generation," ἄμμες αὖ κείνων

φυτευθέντες σθένος ἀελίου χρύσειον λείσσομεν, that is, we too in our turn have our little glimpse of the "golden fawnings of the sun." Theognis, 1071, and 877-78, moralizes more explicitly:

τέρπεό μοι φιλε θυμέ· τάχ' αὖ τινὲς ἄλλοι ἔσονται
ἄνδρες, ἐγὼ δὲ θανὼν γαῖα μέλαιν' ἔσομαι

Plato employs it in tracing the story of Atlantis from Solon and Dropidas to Critias, *Tim.* 20E: πρὸς δὲ Κριτίαν τὸν ἡμέτερον πάππον εἶπεν, ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευεν αὐτὸς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ γέρον. Cf. also *Rep.* 546D. It is of course regularly used in Homeric genealogies as in *Iliad* xx, 215, 219, 231, 236, Δάρδανον αὖ, etc., and in the transmission of the sceptre, *Iliad* ii. 105, 107, where the form is αὐτε.

What this use of αὖ touches lightly with Greek reserve, modern poetry elaborates. Victor Hugo in the "Tristesse d' Olympio" makes his lover say,

Oui, d'autres à leur tour viendront couples sans tache
Puiser dans cet asile heureux calme enchanté
Tout ce que la nature à l'amour qui se cache
Mêle de rêverie et de solennité.

Swinburne's Mealeager cries to Althea:

But thou, O Mother, the dreamer of dreams.
Wilt thou bring forth another to feel the sun's beams,
When I move among shadows a shadow
And wail by impassable streams?

Matthew Arnold touches on it in "Geist's Grave":

Then some who through this garden pass
When we too like thyself are clay.

And again in "Sohrab and Rustum":

The men of former times had crowned the top
With a clay fort; but that was fallen *and now*
The Tartars built there Peran-wisa's tent.

Mutability and the succession of the generations is, of course, a poetical commonplace. I only quote enough to suggest the "Stimmung" of this use of αὖ. The passionate, sometimes comic, counterpart of this sentimental αὖ is the angry or impatient αὖ in the face of a recurrent annoyance. That, too, is first found in Homer. Odysseus, when he awakes in Phaeacia (*Odyssey* vi. 119) and again in Ithaca (*Odyssey* xiii. 200) exclaims, ὦ μοι ἐγὼ τέων αὐτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἰκάνω; The formula expresses his and the reader's sense of his persistent persecution by fate with ever new trials—what is it *this* time? Mr. Shewan, I think, misses this shade of meaning when in *Classical Philology* (Vol. XIII, p. 326), he interprets Odysseus' first words on awakening in Scheria as an expression of Odysseus' feeling that after long traversing of the μέγα λαῖτμα he is back to civilized humankind. As the context shows (ὦ μοι and ὁλοφύρομενος, *Odyssey* xiii. 200) Odysseus is thinking of his past misfortunes and exclaims "What is it *now*?" The locus classicus for this usage

is Io's "There's that gad-fly again" in the Prometheus of Aeschylus (566). The usage is very common and the examples range from a very slight to a comic intensity of emphasis. It expresses the exasperation of Hecuba in *Troades* 707: τίν' αὖ δέδορκα τόνδ' Ἀχαικὸν λάτρην, and of Orestes, *I.T.* 77, ὦ Φοῖβε, ποῖ μ' αὖ τήνδ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες, and of Andromache, *Andromache* 66, . . . ποίας μηχανὰς πλέκουσιν αὖ; of the nurse in the *Hippolytus* 231, of Clytemnestra in *Soph. El.* 328, of Socrates in the *Gorgias* 490B, of Euthydemus in the *Euthydemus* 296A. It is unnecessary to multiply examples further.

Allied to this usage is the slight touch of surprise or rebuke conveyed by the abrupt οὐκ αὖ, used when a proposition is unexpectedly reversed. Similar is the use of ἕτερον αὖ and πάλιν αὖ. Cf. for οὐκ αὖ, Aristophanes, *Knights* 336, 338, *Peace* 281, *Wasps* 942, Plato, *Republic* 393D, 426E, 442A, 499D-E, *Ion* 541A, *Euthydemus* 296A, *Theaet.* 161A, where Burnet's reading, ἦ, misses the point. For ἕτερον αὖ, cf. Aristophanes, *Clouds* 1444, *Birds* 992, *Frogs* 1173, 1371, 1397, *Thesmophoriazusae* 459. For πάλιν αὖ cf. Aristophanes, *Plutus* 622, *Andocides* 2. 16, Eurip., *I.A.* 843, Plato, *Theaet.* 175D, *Protag.* 318E, *Symp.* 190D, *Euthydemus* 298B, *Theaet.* 148B, *Phaedo* 84A, *Rep.* 507B and 511B, *Laws* 797C. In the *Second Alcibiades*, 147E, the abrupt exaggeration of this usage is possibly an indication of spuriousness: ΣΩ. Καὶ ὁρθῶς γέ σοι δοκεῖ. ΑΛ. Πάλιν αὖ μοι δοκεῖ.

These are the most notable specialized uses of αὖ. But there are many other shades of meaning which a historical and statistical study of its use would bring out. I have the material for such a study of which this notelet is only a hint.

PAUL SHOREY

MISCELLA

1. SUTONIUS *Galba* 20. 2

Qui (caput) hasta suffixum non sine ludibrio circum castra portarunt adclamantes identidem: "Galba, Cupido, fruaris aetate tua," maxime irritati ad talem iocorum petulantiam, quod ante paucos dies exierat in vulgus, laudanti cuidam formam suam ut adhuc floridam et vegetam respondisse eum: *ἔτι μοι μένος ἔμπεδόν ἐστιν*.

How difficult it is to attain a satisfactory translation of the soldiers' cry here recorded is illustrated by Rolfe's rendering: "Galba, thou Cupid, exult in thy vigour!" Some light is shed on the matter by another passage (Seneca *Phaed.*, ll. 443 ff.) in which the phrase *aetate frui* appears:

Potius annorum memor
Mentem relaxa; noctibus festis facem
Attole, curas Bacchus exoneret graves.
Aetate fruire; mobili cursu fugit.

Here is the sentiment of the old sleighing song: "Go it while you're young," and the appended clause suggests also *carpe diem*. So *aetate uti* (Ovid *Ars Am.* iii. 63 ff.):

Nec quae praeteriit, iterum revocabitur unda,
 Nec quae praeteriit, hora redire potest.
Utendumst aetate; cito pede labitur aetas,
 Nec bona tam sequitur, quam bona prima fuit.

The verbs *frui* and *uti* overlap to a considerable extent, and metrical convenience here calls for *utendumst*. Compare also the variant in the following, where a Roman commander explains his giving up of a captive maiden to her lover (*Livy* xxvi. 50. 5):

. . . quia ipse, si *frui* liceret *ludo aetatis* . . . , veniam mihi dari sponsam impensius amanti vellem.

In the light of these passages, it is rather obvious what the general meaning of the phrase *aetate frui* is. The soldiers had heard the story of Galba's boast that he was still "some fellow"; and, at the sight of the gray and woe-begone head, some coarse wit started a cry, which we perhaps should render: "Go it, Galba, you Cupid!"

2. OVID *Trist.* iv. 3. 79 ff.

Quae latet inque bonis cessat non cognita rebus,
 Apparet virtus arguiturque malis.
 Dat tibi nostra locum tituli fortuna, caputque
 Conspicuum pietas qua tua tollat, habet.
 Utere temporibus, quorum nunc munere freta es,
 Et patet in laudes area lata tuas.

This poem is addressed by Ovid to his wife, urging her to be loyal to him in his disgrace and to win praise by meeting the issue in a courageous spirit. He intimates that the present difficulties are in one sense an asset, in that they give her a chance to demonstrate the quality of her mettle.

Recent editors consistently abandon the manuscript reading in line 83, proposing emendations such as *facta est* for *freta es*. As given by Owen, the closing couplet reads:

Utere temporibus, quorum nunc munere facta est
 Et patet in laudes area lata tuas.

While this does not alter the general sense of the passage, it introduces a radical change in the construction of this last sentence, and not for the better. From the point of view of style, the couplet as given in the manuscripts is infinitely superior; and it accords with the balanced arrangement elsewhere found in Ovid; e.g. *Amor.* ii. 14. 43 ff.:¹

Di faciles, peccasse semel concedite tuto,
 Et satis est.²

Moreover, there is no good reason for suspecting the soundness of the

¹ See Loers on *Trist.* iv. 3. 83.

² Cf. *Ex Pont.* iii. 4. 99. For other examples, see the note on *Met.* xiii. 254 in the Korn-Ehwald edition.

reading *freta es* in line 83. A recent study has shown that *fretus* has both a passive and an active sense,¹ the former being well illustrated in the following passage (Q. Cicero *de Petit. Con.* 25):

Et quamquam partis ac fundatis amicitiiis fretum ac munitum esse oportet, tamen in ipsa petitione amicitiae permultae ac peritiles comparantur.

The writer of these words is discussing the support which a man needs to have built up for his candidacy in advance (cf. § 16); it is not at all a question of the candidate's confidence in his backing.² We therefore render: "buttressed and secured by old and well-established friendships."

So, in the passage now under discussion, *freta* has about the force of *instructa*: "Lay hold on the present situation, by whose opportuneness you are supported—and a wide field lies open for your (acquisition of) fair fame."

3. *Juvenal*, x. 16 ff.

Longinum et magnos Senecae praedivitis hortos
Clausit et egregias Lateranorum obsidet aedes
Tota cohors: rarus venit in caenacula miles.

Recent editors are using here rather carelessly the doctrine that a Latin adjective may be equivalent to an adverb, asserting that *rarus* in line 18 is a substitute for *raro*.

Such an interpretation quite overlooks the fact that *rarus miles* marks an antithesis to *tota cohors*. Indeed, that latter phrase is justified only in that it looks forward to the coming balance. *Whole companies* round up the rich prizes; but *few and far between* are the soldiers who make their way into garrets.

H. C. NUTTING

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CICERO'S ATTITUDE TOWARD LUCRETIVS

"Lucretii poemata, ut scribis, ita sunt, multis luminibus ingenii; multae tamen artis. Sed cum veneris virum te putabo si Sallustii Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo" (*Ad Q. Fr.* ii. 9 [11]).

The plural *poemata* Bockemüller (ed. *Lucr.*, p. 5) took to mean brief passages separately published. But in addition to the distinction between *poema* and *poesis* quoted in Harper's *Lexicon* from Lucilius, which, as far as it obtains, would incline a writer to pluralize *poema* in applying it to the whole of a long poem, it is instructive to note that Lucretius himself, in a cross-reference to his first book in his sixth (vs. 937), writes in *primo carmine*. Also, Ovid's famous tribute to the poem (*Am.* i. 15. 23 f.) refers to it as *carmina*

¹ "On the Syntax of *Fretus*," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, VIII, No. 8, 305 ff.

² For full discussion of the passive and the active use of *fretus*, see the article just cited.

and contains a reminiscence of v. 95, which is at the end of a résumé or table of contents and not in one of the separable literary passages Bockemüller has in mind. Compare Gellius i. 21. 5.

In this much-discussed letter there is no adverse criticism of Lucretius unless supplied by interpolations of modern commentators. As for those, Munro², II, 17 ff., followed by Tyrrell-Purser, shows that the *tamen* does not demand a *non* before either *multis* or *multae*, but merely admits the common antithesis between the two qualities of *ingenium* and *ars* which Lucretius possesses. I agree with Hendrickson (*AJP.*, XXII, 438) that *multae tamen artis* was probably Marcus' qualification of Quintus' compliment as to flashes of genius. But whether so or quoted, it is at any rate accepted along with the first phrase. The statement in Merrill's edition of Lucretius (p. 19) that "Cicero approves his brother's judgment in a careless, unsympathetic manner" seems to me unduly strong. For his comment is not in a formal review of the *De rerum Natura*, but is part of one of four items in a short letter on wax tablets in which he is "rambling on" (*alucinari*, sec. 1) to his brother.¹ Of course his contempt for Epicurus would have prevented his being positively enthusiastic about the poem.

Tyrrell-Purser and others take *sed cum veneris*, to be followed by some such phrase as "we shall discuss this further," as referring back to the Lucretius item. But, (1) though Cicero uses formulas of postponement beginning with *sed*, they are commonly elliptical (*Sed haec coram* in *Fam.* ix. 8. 2. *Sed haec posterius* in *Att.* iv. 4. 5. *Sed adsum*; *coram igitur* in *Att.* xii. 11); (2) he has no occasion for postponement of matter in a letter in which he is not hurried and admittedly (sec. 1), after other letters written to Quintus, has little to say; and (3) the future perfect *legeris* is vague and pointless without *sed cum veneris*. To take the text according to the MSS without lacuna, and the three words as looking forward, makes perfectly good sense.

And that sense is made clear, not only by the contrast between *vir* and *homo* found elsewhere in Cicero (Tyrrell-Purser, *ad loc.*), but also by a jest, I think, at the expense of Empedocles as well as Sallust (whoever the latter may be).² Empedocles' profession that he was a god (fr. 112 Diels) became a matter of jest. At the end of the *Ars Poetica* Horace says that the poet, anxious to be considered a god, will not reform and become a *homo* though you save him once from his spectacular death. Earlier in Cicero's letter he had used the phrase *reliquis diebus* of Quintus' further absence from Rome, so that it cannot have been protracted. He ends the letter by saying in effect, "I subscribe to your opinion of the merits of the other philosophical poem. But if, in the few days before your return, you shall have read Sallust's *Empedoclea*, I'll regard you as a hero, but like Empedocles not a human being." The odd order of clauses may be accounted for by the natural habit of beginning the last sentence of a letter with a reference to the next meeting of

¹ Cf. Sihler, "Lucretius and Cicero," *TAPA*, XXVIII, 46.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 48 f.

the correspondents, and by the fact that the last clause, if not an afterthought suggested by the word *Empedoclea*, would at any rate tend to lose its humorous implication if brought in before it. As for Cicero's mood at the time, there is another playful pun earlier in the letter (*Tenediorum, Tenedia*); and in general he liked to end a letter, when appropriate, with a humorous or epigrammatic turn (cf. *Fam.* vii. 6, 7, 16, 22; ix. 20).

The actual evidence we have is as follows: (1) Cicero had read the poem within four months after its publication and approved without any negative qualification Quintus' favorable verdict on its inspiration and technique, or quite possibly added the praise on the second count. (2) Jerome says that he edited the poem; however little *emendavit* may mean, this was a friendly act. There is no reason for doubting Jerome or his sources as to the editing (cf. Merrill in *Cl. Rev.*, x. 19). (3) Though the subject matter was against Cicero's philosophical dogmas, this was nine years before he began to interest himself greatly in philosophy (Giussani ed. I, xv), and as literature the poem has more in common with the older poets whom he quotes than with the νεώτεροι whom he disdains. (4) The fact that the poet had imitated Cicero's *Aratea* (Abbott ed. Cic., *Letters, ad loc.*) and its meters (Peck in *TAPA.*, XXVIII, 60 f.) would not be without effect on the latter's vanity, and passages in Cicero's philosophical works closely resemble lines of Lucretius (cf. Munro on V, 619; Martha, *Le Poème de Lucrece*, p. 351; Reily, *Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero*, p. 3 and n. 1). (5) Cicero does not mention other contemporary poets, such as Catullus who complimented him. (6) He was a close friend of the Epicurean Atticus and once wrote Memmius on behalf of the Epicurean School.

Cicero may not have been a close student of this poem of his contemporary, nor, owing to the opinions it expressed, enthusiastic about it. But any claim that he was positively unfriendly to it as a work of literature goes against the facts listed above and depends upon modern interpolations or *argumenta ex silentio* or both.

CLYDE MURLEY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

CORRIGENDUM

I wish to correct a misstatement of mine made in *Classical Philology*, XXIII (1928), 64:

In his commentary, Burnet does translate the fragment under discussion, locating correctly the subject of *ἰθίλα*. My translation follows his in this, but suggests more specific meanings for *φνείν* and *ἔρδαν*.

I regret that my absorption in his very interesting discussion of the variants caused me to fail to notice that the note ran farther back. I thus lost the opportunity of strengthening my case in part by the citation of his authority, and the pleasure of rendering credit where credit was due.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur, in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung, ein Versuch. By KARL KERÉNYI. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.

Miss Jane Harrison, in her very entertaining *Reminiscences of a Student's Life*, tells how in the days of her study at Cambridge in the seventies classics were turning in their long sleep; old men began to see visions, young men to dream dreams. The great lights which were to disturb the long complacent sleep of linguistic virtuosity and textual criticisms were archaeology and anthropology. The visions which archaeology evoked from the buried past have in the nature of things proved the more vivid and substantial; the dreams of anthropology have been more confused and turbid, serving too often only for unhealthy vaticination, and the replacing of inherited dogmatism by new superstition. Classical literature has felt the influence of these two sources of light at a multitude of points. Anthropology has laid rude hands upon some of the most cherished beauties of Hellenic art. Taboo and tokens have not been content to stay with the savages of the South Seas, but have reared their heads in the serene temples of Zeus and Apollo. What we had learned to look upon as the creative art of a gifted people turns out to be the survival of primitive and barbaric ritual placating a new year's or vegetation *daimon*, and very much it appears that things are not what they seem. Students in touch with the progress of such investigations have discerned one field after another invaded by this restless search after origins. Our confidence in certain final results has more than once been rudely shaken by the sacrilegious anthropologist entering the finished edifice with his destructive parallels and analogues.

The latest territory to be thus invaded is the Greek "Romances," which are presented to us in this book "in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung." But the promised light is not a sun—a series of flashes rather thrown here and there into a thicket of darkness. It is a book hard to read and deficient in clear exposition of results, and for its review it calls for a more experienced student of *Religionsgeschichte* than the present writer. It is plain, however, that it presents a thesis which will have to be taken into account. It proceeds from the school of F. Boll (to whose memory it is dedicated) by an author learned and ingenious, and desperately at home in the literature of religious origins.

Its essential theme is an answer to the problem propounded by Rohde: "aus welchen verborgenen Ursprüngen entstand in Griechenland das ganz

Ungriechische." The answer is that the "Romances" represent later and secularized versions of the myth and initiation ritual of the worship of Isis. The material of investigation is grouped into chapters or topics, which constitute the main thrills of the plots common to practically all of the stories: death and resurrection, divinity and suffering, crucifixion and transfiguration, erotic motives of separation, temptation, and triumphant chastity—all grouped about a geographical scene which was originally the Nile and the Syrian Coast. In its origins the narrative of the myth was for the edification of the initiate, "a teaching and an encouragement to piety for all men and women that should hereafter fall into like misfortunes" (Plut. *De Iside* 27). From this (though the author is vague in tracing the steps) it passed or drifted gradually from religious significance to a story of mere entertainment, and in this process received countless embellishments and modifications. In origin too it was frankly a miracle story (*ἀμιταλογία*), but in the Greek romances the miraculous element has been somewhat obliterated to conform to a qualified reason and probability (*πλάσμα*).

The association of the Romances with the cult of Isis is of course not absolutely new; it is yielded in fact by the texts themselves, and a brief but significant hint of the relationship was given by Christ-Schmid (II, 811). The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius end, it will be recalled, in the recognition of Isis as the true and ultimate divinity, the deliverer, while the whole action of Xenophon of Ephesus takes its start from the oracle which bids the lovers journey to the Nile and offer gifts to Isis the saviour (i. 6. 2). But that which Kerényi discerns as the original meaning and source of the plot, earlier investigators have looked upon apparently as merely external machinery yielded by the prominence of the Isis cult in the period. It is significant that the Index of Rohde does not even contain the entry "Isis."

Concerning the soundness of the author's conclusions it is difficult to pass summary judgment. The theory fits some of the Romances much more easily than others. Chariton and Longus are perhaps most remote from it both in scenery and in spirit, yet in plot and general technique they cannot be separated from the rest. As annotation to the Romances the book is a mine of valuable material. It will be more likely to provoke new discussion than to be accepted as a final solution.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

NEW HAVEN

Platon I. Eidos. Paideia. Dialogos. By PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1928.

A definitive estimate of this book will be possible only after the appearance of the second volume which will deal with the philosophy of Plato and with the individual dialogues in detail. At first reading it appears to be a series of well-written essays on certain aspects of Platonism sufficiently documented by references to the text and recent literature but not so overburdened

as to repel an intelligent layman. More careful study discovers in it a definite and consistent point of view in the interpretation of Plato and a well-planned Introduction to the closer analyses of Platonic thought which the second volume will presumably bring.

Professor Friedländer thinks that the relative importance of philosophy or metaphysics in Plato's life and thought has been overestimated. Politics in the broader sense was the main interest for a young Athenian of Plato's family and environment, and politics is the theme of fully half of his extant writings. Only when practical participation in Athenian politics became impossible for him did he found the Academy and divert his political ambition to the education of possible statesmen and reformers. To the same conclusion point Plato's journeys to the court of Dionysius and the composition of his *Laws* first for Syracuse and then for his imaginary Cretan state. The keynote of this interpretation is given by what Friedländer believes to be Plato's own account of his development in the seventh epistle, with two pages of which the book begins.

My exceptions to these generalizations are fewer than I at first supposed. The social or political interest was doubtless as prominent in Plato's mind as it is quantitatively in his writings. I happen to be personally more interested in his philosophy. But Professor Friedländer would doubtless admit that the exaggerated attention which some give to the Platonic metaphysics is no reason why we should not endeavor to understand it correctly and to trace its influence in the subsequent history of European thought. Plato is many sided, and in the subdivision of labor there is room for many ways of approach.

Professor Friedländer accepts not only the seventh Platonic epistle, but the second, third, and sixth which I think spurious.¹ He makes great use of the *Epistles*, as all who wish to write entertainingly of Plato's personality are tempted to do.² But he rarely if ever misuses them. He either quotes harmless passages which contain nothing that Plato might not have said, though I think he would have said it differently, or he puts a harmless interpretation upon passages which others use to portray a Pythagorean, mystic, and superstitious Plato. From this error Friedländer is free throughout his book, though the language he sometimes uses in his desire to avoid the opposite extreme of a soulless and matter-of-fact rationalism will mislead readers who wish to be misled. Cf., e.g., page 49: "Gewiss, dies ist ein Mythos, und die Platoniker haben sehr unrecht getan ein Dogma daraus zu machen. Doch wenn man sagt, es sei 'nur mythisch,' hat man eben so unrecht und umgeht die Frage, was denn damit gewollt sei."

After this general characterization I must limit myself to a few points

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XVIII, 361; XXI, 280; XXII, 107; X, 87; VIII, 387 f. Cf. also my review of Hackforth, "The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles," *Nation*, XCVII, 460-61.

² Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XIX, 379 ff.

which interest me. In developing the thesis that politics was Plato's main interest the first chapter states and other chapters repeat that he discovered the ideas on the way to the state. If that only means that the idea both as an ideal and as an instrument of education is indispensable to the reformed state I concur. But the actual development of the Platonic idea out of the concept or definition and the epistemological problem is too plain to be denied as I have shown elsewhere,¹ and as is incidentally brought out in Ivo Bruns's excellent book. And I am sorry that Professor Friedländer lends his support to the many unphilosophical philologists who deny it. Cf., e.g., page 19, "Dass gar Sokrates, das εἶδος entdeckt und Platon daraus die ἰδέα gemacht hätte ist eine Konstruktion . . . die durch nichts bewiesen werden kann," and also, page 17, "wir werden uns auch hüten von Ideenlehre zu sprechen, es sei denn bei dem alten Platon, bei dem man wohl dieses verfestigte Denkschema schon einmal antrifft (τῇ τῶν εἰδῶν σοφία τῇ καλῇ ταύτῃ, Brief VI. 322 D)." I naturally approve the statement on page 8 and pages 57-58 that the Republic is the center toward which the *Protagoras*, the *Laches*, point, not only in design but almost expressly.²

The emphasis laid on the visual suggestions of εἶδος and ἰδέα (pp. 16-17) is right provided again that we do not forget the connection of the words with epistemology and the logic of the definition. The Platonic idea in short has at least three aspects, the logical, the metaphysical, and the aesthetic, and only the study of the context can tell us which is in any given sentence uppermost in Plato's intention. It is quite useless to say without qualification the Platonic idea is just this or that and nothing else.³

Very refreshing is the good sense of "aber Geometrie lehrte auch Hippias, dazu brauchte man nicht nach Italien zu gehen."

Chapter ii, "Daimon," is a very interesting study first of the Daimonion of Socrates, then of the daimonic element in the personalities of Socrates and Plato and in the writings of Plato followed by a sketch of the later history of the doctrine of daemons. Chapter iii, "Arrheton," deals in the main with Plato's attitude toward the transcendent, the ultimate, the unknowable, or at any rate the inexpressible in matter-of-fact logic. Here, too, the author aims to hold the just mean between sentimentality and arid rationalism. He points out how little Plato tells us of the ideas (p. 69), and repeats that there is no system of metaphysics in Plato.⁴

¹ *Unity of Plato's Thought*, pp. 27 ff.; cf. my paper, "The Question of the Socratic Element in Plato," *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy*, pp. 577 f.

² Cf. *Unity of Plato's Thought*, p. 78, 14, 18.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 27.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 28: "Except in purely mythical passages, Plato does not attempt to describe the ideas any more than Kant describes the *Ding-an-sich* or Spencer the 'Unknowable.' He does not tell us what they are, but that they are. And the difficulties, clearly recognized by Plato, which attach to the doctrine thus rightly limited, are precisely those that confront any philosophy that assumes an absolute."

He rightly says (p. 71) that Hoffmann is mistaken in saying that the gap between the highest principle and the ideas is as great as that between the ideas and the things of sense.

I fail with him as I do with so many others to get any recognition for what seems to me the very simple truth that in the *Republic* the idea of good means mainly (I never said exclusively) a social, political, and ethical idea which only a highly educated statesman can apprehend. Friedländer seems to admit only its metaphysical or mystical interpretation. He emphasizes, however (p. 75), as I have done, the way to the apprehension of the idea and the fact that the vision is won only by hard work.¹ He rightly insists that there is no *Geheimnisthuerei*, though how he can say he finds none in the second epistle I cannot understand. "Nichts kann Platonferner sein als solch ekstatischer Überschwang, der sich so gern Platonischer Formeln bedient [p. 90]."

He is careful to distinguish Plato from Plotinus and complains (p. 97) that "selbst der greise Natorp war wohl geneigt, Platon zu sehr im Sinne Plotins zu interpretieren."

Chapter iv, "Akademie," discusses the relation of Platon's teaching to his writings and argues that the passages about mathematical astronomy in the *Republic* are not hostile to science.²

Chapter v, "Das geschriebene Werk," deals not with Plato's literary art, but with the question of the value of the written as compared with the spoken word. In discussing the *locus classicus* in the *Phaedrus* he ignores Ivo Bruns's suggestion that disdain for the written word must be a trait of Socrates who never wrote rather than an opinion of Plato himself. He finds the idea already in *Protagoras* 329a, and as he accepts the letters is obliged to defend against the charge of *Geheimnisthuerei* the absurd passage in *Epistle* ii. 314a. He says it was intended only to mystify Dionysius, who had written about Platonic philosophy (p. 132). The statement that there are no writings of Plato, but those that are so called belong to a Socrates who has become young and beautiful, is interpreted to mean that Plato put all that he could put into words into the mouth of Socrates (pp. 152-53). The statement (p. 139) "Für Platon war Euripides *διαφέρων ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ*" misses the irony of *Rep.* 568a and will mislead the reader. Plato certainly preferred Aeschylus and Sophocles to Euripides. The ingenious theory that the return to the banishment of the poets in the first half of the tenth book of the *Republic* was intended to suggest that Plato's own dialogues are the type of poetry that would be allowed in the well-ordered state is supported by the too ingenious argument that the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* are full of hymns to the gods and that the *Republic* may be interpreted as a hymn to the highest good.

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 16 f.

² Cf. my paper, "Platonism and the History of Science," *American Philosophical Society's Proceedings*, LXVI (1927), 171 ff.

Chapter vi, "Socrates bei Platon," pays no attention to the Burnet-Taylor theory which Friedländer had already dismissed (p. 32) and very little to Ivo Bruns's careful examination of the question. The person and personal traits of Socrates in Plato are historical, allowing for some inevitable idealization. The ideas put in his mouth are often Platonic. As is the fashion in Germany today, he thinks that there must have been some such passionate relation between Socrates and Plato as the *Symposium* attributes to Socrates and Alcibiades. He does not follow the fashion of drawing a sharp line between dialogues intended only to portray Socrates and dialogues with a philosophic purpose.

I must dismiss with a bare reference the very readable chapter vii on "Ironie," including Socratic ignorance and the higher poetical irony of Plato himself; chapter viii, "Dialog"; chapter ix, "Mythos"; and the instructive Appendix on "Plato als Geograph." I look forward with much interest to the second volume of this important work.

PAUL SHOREY

Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg. Herausgegeben von FRITZ SAXL. II. *Vorträge, 1922-23.* I. Teil. Berlin and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1924.

Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg. Herausgegeben von FRITZ SAXL. *Vorträge, 1923-24.* Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1926.

The second volume of the Warburg *Vorträge* opens with Dr. Ernst Cassirer's thoughtful lectures on "Das Problem des Schönen und der Kunst in Platons *Dialogen*." Cassirer begins with the praise of the many-sidedness and yet the unity of Plato. In his treatment of art only an unreconciled inner dissonance appears. The separation of idea and sensible appearance of *εἶδος* and *εἰδωλον* is sharp. In physics there is a partial reconciliation through mathematics. But Plato rejects the mediations that have been attempted in apologies for art. The artist does not contemplate and imitate the idea, but imitates its copy in the world of sense. He is essentially one with the sophist. His influence is opposed to that conversion of the soul from the shadows to the realities which in the symbolism of the cave is for Plato the beginning of higher education and of true philosophy. The idea may not be identified with the vaguer modern romantic conception of the ideal. Yet Plato himself was deeply sensitive to the spell of art and of Homer. His *Phaedrus* assigns a distinctive place to the idea of beauty because it alone has a visible embodiment in this world. And the vision of the sea of beauty in the *Symposium* is the vision of an artist as well as of the dialectician. These and similar concessions in Plato's own writings make it easy for later ascetics to find in Plato himself the grounds for a reversal of his condemnation of imitative art and his verdict of banishment on the poets.

The essay is an admirable lecture, and it would be unfair to ask more of it than a lecture can give. I may be permitted to point out, however, that while endeavoring to trace a development and progress in Plato's attitude toward art Cassirer intermingles his references to the *Republic*, the seventh epistle, which he accepts, the *Sophist*, and the *Philebus* in a manner that is incompatible with a theory of continuous chronological evolution of Plato's opinions, and that confirms again my view of the essential unity of Plato's thought.

The learned and immensely documented article of A. Doren, "Fortuna im Mittelalter und in dem Renaissance," after an introduction on fortune in antiquity especially in Boethius, follows the history of the subject through the literature and art of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Special attention is paid to the symbols and representations in art visualized by seven tables and twenty illustrations. But the hundred and fifty-six footnotes present an enormous store of quotations and references to the literature.

Not less erudite is the elaborate article of Percy Ernst Schramm on "Das Herrscherbild in der Kunst des frühen Mittelalters" which is also amply illustrated.

The volume for 1923-24 is signalized by an article by Professor Wilamowitz who, wasting no time on any reference to ancient sources or modern interpreters or Cook's *Zeus*, gives us his ripe reflections on the evolution of Zeus and on Greek religion generally. Zeus is not the god of the sky. *Sub divo* and "Zeus rains" are late expressions. Zeus is the god of thunder and lightning seated on Olympus or Ida or any convenient hill, gradually promoted to be king of the gods, father of gods and men, moral ruler of the universe—god in general. In Greece the religion of the philosophers replaced that of the poets. Cleanthes' hymn, which is both philosophy and poetry, is still the object of Wilamowitz' enthusiasm. He is confident that there can be nothing Semitic about it. The gods of Greece died. New religions sprang up among the populace. But a god lives as long as he has believers, and the only way to understand a god is to believe in him.

Professor Ernst Hoffmann's "Platonismus im Mittelalter" belies its title. It says nothing concrete about the Middle Ages. It consists mainly of a general abstract and dogmatic characterization of Plato's philosophy as Professor Hoffmann conceives it. After the minor dialogues that will *nur* portray Socrates (why this absolute *nur*?), and from the *Gorgias* on, the principle of that philosophy is the rigid separation of the two worlds, the higher and lower, the world of sense and the world of thought. I cannot give further details which we are told will be presented more fully in a forthcoming book by Professor Hoffmann. The present essay except for a few notes in the *Anhang* contains no specific references to the text of Plato and no exact analysis of the course of his thought. Professor Hoffmann protests against a misuse of the word Platonism to cover neo-Platonism in the Middle Ages. But surely neo-Platonism is a part of the history of Platonism.

In contrast to this paper the erudite essay on "Kosmologische Motive in der Bildungswelt der Frühscholastik," by Hans Liebeschütz, is a richly documented study of the development of ideas ultimately derived from the *Timaeus* and its commentators, in Johannes Scotus, the school of Chartres Abelard, Wilhelm de Conches, and Bernardus Sylvestris. I suppose that it is idle to regret that there is no explicit reference to the Chicago dissertation of Dr. Frank Eggleston Robbins on "The Hexaemeral Literature," which is fuller and more critical in its field many of the authorities used by Liebeschütz.

Space and personal competence are lacking to discuss the other articles that make up this rich and interesting volume whose value is enhanced by a full Index. They are: "Die nordischen, persischen und christlichen Vorstellungen vom Weltuntergang," by Richard Reitzenstein; "Die Umwandlung der orientalischen Religionen unter dem Einfluss hellenischen Geistes," by Hugo Gressmann; "Gladiatorenblut und Märtyrerblut," by Franz Dölger; "Frühmittelalterliche illustrierte Enzyklopädien," by Adolph Goldschmidt; "Rechtssymbolik im germanischen und römischen Recht," by Conrad Borchling.

PAUL SHOREY

Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri IV. Recensuit F. CALONGHI.
Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum. Turin: G. B. Paravia, 1928.

Tibullus. Edidit FR. W. LEVY. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.

Calonghi's edition was set up by the printer in 1926 and would have appeared in that year but for a printer's stupidity in breaking up the type. Levy's edition appeared too late to be used by Calonghi.

The nature of the edition could be surmised from the various articles published by Calonghi in recent years. His chief contribution—and it is a real one—is in proving the value of the Genoa manuscript. In these days when editors seem to have abandoned in large part the custom of combing Europe for manuscripts, it may be said that Calonghi was fortunate in finding a worth-while manuscript in his home town. But he was more than fortunate, for he had the acuteness to penetrate the layers of humanistic emendations down to the original important elements. For the Genoa manuscript is independent of A and is of some real help in restoring the text. Of course A still remains the chief basis of the text, as Calonghi readily admits. As to V, he leaves open the question of its relation to A, but implies that it is of no independent value. Readings from other manuscripts are cited only as plausible emendations, not as representing genuine tradition. The Paris excerpts are rightly judged to be of less value than usually supposed.

Calonghi's point of view is best presented in his own words (p. vii):

Quod ad recensionem nostram attinet, lectiones Ambrosiani etiam maiore quam reliqui editores constantia servavimus, nihil umquam mutavimus, nihil, post Leonis Vahleni aliorumque disputationes, transponere decrevimus coniecturisque parvam plerumque adiunximus fidem, nostris etiam quas quidem perraro dubitanterque tempavimus.

Although Levy's edition was published before Calonghi's, I am putting it in second place because he made use of Calonghi's results as published in various articles. The greater pretentiousness of the edition justifies a more critical attitude on the part of the reviewer. An edition with a critical introduction of twenty-two pages and an apparatus which averages nearly a half-page in length gives the appearance of being something definitive. It is far from being that. As far as the manuscripts are concerned, Levy has made a very slight contribution. Of the several hundred existing manuscripts, he collated one directly and examined another—both at Berlin, where he lives. He also had photographs of A and V. The new contributions belong chiefly to two sources: Calonghi's collation of the Genoa manuscript, whose importance he recognizes, and Bürger's notes on the Ambrosian manuscript (A). It should be said that Bürger was to have prepared this edition but met his death early in the war. The new point about A is the recognition that many of the corrections and marginalia are in the hand of Coluccio Salutati. This view I communicated to Bürger many years ago, and I am glad to see it adopted by him and Levy.

Levy thinks it a delusion to hope for the discovery of better manuscripts than we now know. He comes to this conclusion on the basis of the two previously unreported manuscripts which he examined and the few that have been previously discussed. He is probably right, but his opinion cannot be said to be authoritative. It is somewhat amusing that on another page he quotes with disapproval Lachmann's statement that better manuscripts will never be found than those which he uses. Levy's procedure is strikingly like Lachmann's: he stays in Berlin and makes categorical statements about manuscripts he has not seen or even heard of. One expects a different attitude after one hundred years.

In dealing with the history of the tradition, Levy rightly sees that Pastrengo of Verona used a florilegium, not a complete manuscript.¹ On the question of whether Petrarch had a Tibullus, he displays commendable caution. He does not mention Nohac's book on *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*.

Levy's acceptance of V as a manuscript of some value is, in my opinion, a backward step; but this is not the place to argue the matter. Another of Baehrens' manuscripts, G, he rightly rejects. He even goes back to Lachmann's manuscripts. He rejects B (Paris 7989, not 7909), but finds value in the others. Lachmann's A (Levy's *y*), the lost York manuscript, he restores to its former position, as he does Lachmann's C, a combination of three manuscripts (*c d e*). The York manuscript is known from a collation in Berlin; *d* and *e* are in Berlin; *c* is known from Broukhusius. For not one of the four did

¹ See my article in *Classical Philology*, XXIII (1928), 128 ff.

Lachmann or Levy need to travel a mile out of Berlin. Is it likely that none of the two hundred or more manuscripts in other libraries is as important as these? To paraphrase the old phrase, the motto of Lachmann and Levy is, *Ubicumque patria est, sunt boni codices*.

In dealing with the florilegia, Levy comes to the conclusion that the lost York manuscript was independently derived from the common archetype of A and the florilegia. I can only say that this is absurd without taking the space to show this in detail. Levy makes use of a hitherto unreported florilegium found by Bürger at Munich, but his dating of it as eleventh century is quite impossible.¹

So much for the introductions and general points of view of the two editions. In the matter of text, Calonghi follows A wherever possible. So in the first poem he restores (as compared with Postgate's second edition) *modo* (25), *identes* (29), *Hic* (35), *igne* (48). All except the second are found also in Levy. The second and fourth involve the rejection of the authority of the Paris florilegia. But Levy feels freer to deviate from A: he follows late manuscripts in *Et* for *Te* (60), he reads *neque* in 64 (also 71), he follows the florilegia in the order *Despiciam dites* (78). His restoration of *est* in 34 seems to me justified. In i. 2. 3 he abandons *percussum* for *perfusum*. In i. 3. 4 he follows late manuscripts in reading *precior atra* instead of *modo nigra*, the reading of A retained by Calonghi. In i. 3. 12 Calonghi returns to A's reading of *triviis*, instead of the usual *trinis*. In lines 17-18 he keeps *dant* and *Saturni*. Levy also keeps the latter instead of the usual *Saturnive*. Levy has no hesitation in changing the adjective modifiers of *dies* in this line and in iii. 6. 32 from feminine to masculine. In i. 4. 55 Levy prefers the late reading *offeret*. Both editors return to the manuscript readings *sed* and *Et* in i. 5. 20 and 42. In i. 5. 61 Levy wisely returns to A's *praesto tibi praesto*, while Calonghi sticks to the reading of P. In general we may say that Levy and Calonghi both at times go back to the readings of A and especially abandon those of the florilegia. Levy, however, is inclined to be attracted too much by readings in late manuscripts and by modern emendations; Calonghi, though occasionally printing one of his own emendations, sticks rather closely—perhaps too closely—to A. The fault, if it is one, is a good one.

Calonghi's apparatus is brief, as is characteristic of the other volumes in this series. Levy's is quite full, but is burdened with much unnecessary material. He quotes generously from the Brescia manuscript of which he had knowledge from Calonghi's published collation. Calonghi himself does not quote it—and wisely so, as it is worthless. Levy reproduces the abbreviations of the Paris florilegia as given by Meyncke—a senseless procedure—and even the long final *s* of a minor florilegium in Munich.

Calonghi's edition is one of the best of the Paravia series; Levy's is an average text judged by the Teubner standard of recent years.

B. L. ULLMAN

¹ See my article previously referred to.

Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and the Romans and Their Influence.

By JAMES TURNER ALLEN. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. Pp. xii+206. Price \$2.00.

Professor Allen has divided his book into twelve succinct chapters as follows: i, "Greek Drama"; ii, "Dramatic Art at Rome"; iii, "Dramatic Festivals: Athens"; iv, "Dramatic Festivals: Rome"; v, "The Greek Theater: Its Essential Features; Development and Successive Transformations"; vi, "The Theater of Dionysus at Athens"; vii, "Graeco-Roman and Roman Theaters"; viii, "Properties; Scenes; Mechanical Devices"; ix, "The Chorus and Spectacle"; x, "Actors and Acting, Costumes"; xi, "Influences: the Theater, Scenic Arrangements"; xii, "Influences: the Drama." There are, also, a Preface (pp. v-vii; wrongly assigned to p. ix in the Table of Contents), Notes (pp. 185-92), a Bibliography (pp. 193-98), and an Index (pp. 201-6).

At the very start Professor Allen has forestalled criticism by the following words:

The limitations of space have made necessary a rigorous selection of material and a high degree of condensation. In consequence many details have had to be sacrificed, even whole topics omitted. Controversial matters especially have been pruned to the quick. *The result, I fear, will please no one, even as it fails to satisfy my own desires.* But if it shall appear that the most essential facts have been presented and that in a reasonably clear and unbiassed manner I shall rest content [pp. v f., italics mine].

It may be said at once that the author is justly entitled to this contentment. He continues:

One aspect of the subject in particular, although not wholly neglected, could not be presented with the fullness that it deserves: the relation of the physical playhouse and the mechanics of stagecraft to dramatic literature and the art of the theatre. Yet herein lies the real justification of a study of stage antiquities.

Here it must be conceded that, if the author had at hand other important material bearing upon this topic, he owed it to his public and publishers to present it. I miss, for example, a passage such as opens the chapter on "Literature" in Livingstone's *The Legacy of Greece*.

An easy way of criticizing a work of scholarship is to find fault with its Bibliography. The author is not altogether free of this weakness, and so it is not surprising that he feels constrained to apologize for his own and to supplement it as follows: "In the following selection the list has been pared to the quick; for other titles see the preceding notes and consult the bibliographies contained in the books mentioned below, especially those numbered 1, 2, 5, 8, 26, 31, 91, and 94." As a matter of fact, except in a professed *Bibliographischer Wegweiser* or in a Doctor's dissertation, where usually only a narrow segment of a small field is under consideration, exhaustive bibliographies are no longer feasible. In the present volume, when one considers its relatively

small size and the number of scholars who have busied themselves with these matters, Allen's bibliographical references must be acknowledged to be generous. Pickard-Cambridge's new book, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy* (Oxford, 1927), appeared too recently to be cited.

In the last paragraph, No. 26 refers to *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*, which is cited again and again. In this connection perhaps I may be pardoned for saying that Allen's views of the Greek theater and mine come more nearly to coinciding than is perhaps true of any other two workers in this field. In the matter of origins, too, where I do not recall that the author had previously published anything, he closely parallels my conclusions. In consequence, I find little with which to disagree along any of these lines.

Possibly the least satisfactory feature of the book is the distribution of the illustrations, which seldom stand where they belong. Thus, Figure 2 faces page 4 but ought to be opposite page 7; Figure 3, facing page 20, is discussed on page 11; Figure 4 should stand opposite page 20 instead of page 40; etc.,. The source of the illustrations, also, is not always indicated.

In view of Allen's remarks in the *Classical Journal*, XXII, 631, one is amazed to find the Rieti statuette of a tragic actor (Fig. 22) included among the illustrations. The fact is that the figure is indispensable in the discussion of the subject. The author has raised an interesting point here by suggesting that the rectangular blocks beneath the feet were not *cothurnoi*, as is usually supposed, but supports to fasten the figure to its base.

Especially interesting to me is the description (pp. 155-57) of the Theatro Olimpico at Vicenza, which I had the privilege of examining in 1923. It seems to be enjoying a recrudescence of attention just now (cf. Enid Rose, *First Studies in Dramatic Art* [1926], pp. 237 f., and J. T. Sheppard, *Aeschylus and Sophocles* [1927], pp. 108 f.).

Strangely enough this review has been largely devoted to defending Professor Allen's book against his own self-criticisms. Nevertheless, he has produced a worth-while volume which can be warmly recommended to an interested public.

ROY C. FLICKINGER

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Plato VIII. Charmides, Alcibiades i and ii, Hipparchus, The Lovers, Minos, Theages, Epinomis. Translated by W. R. M. LAMB. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927.

The dialogues in this volume of the Loeb Plato are with the exception of the *Charmides* and the possible exception of the *Epinomis* usually regarded as spurious. Mr. Lamb writes a brief, general introduction to the volume giving his impression of Plato's life and writings. The special introduction to the

Charmides is sufficient for the general reader, but does not touch on the deeper problem raised in the latter part of the dialogue. The introductions to the presumably spurious dialogues are excellent characterizations of these interesting little works and without reference to the special literature of the question give Mr. Lamb's own sensible and modestly expressed reasons for rejection or acceptance. He is inclined to accept the first *Alcibiades*. He rejects the second though he thinks it worth reading, the *Lovers* because of the clumsy abruptness of the last section, the *Theages* (which for the rest the first sentence condemns) because of the lack of humor and the superstitious stories which Socrates tells of himself, the *Minos* though it is a fairly plausible imitation of Plato's early work and the *Epinomis* because when we consider it in detail "we very soon become aware of contact with an inferior mind." This last argument applies I think to all these, as I deem them, spurious dialogues. But it will seem purely subjective to many rehabilitating critics. And there is a real difficulty in the fact that the inferior mind is capable now and then of a sentiment or a sentence which makes us rub our eyes and cry "aut Plato, aut Diabolus."

The translation as in the other volumes of the series done by Mr. Lamb is in the main correct. And the English is pleasant and idiomatic. Mr. Lamb is apparently not quite an expert in Plato, and the meaning of some of the more difficult passages of the *Epinomis* escapes him.

In 973 A, *διανοηθῆ* is not "intends."

In 977 B, *βραχέων ἕνεκα* is not "for brevity's sake," but "only for a few purposes."

In 978 B, *ἀληθοῦς δόξης ἐπιλαβόμενος* is not "with a hold on true opinion"; the phrase is antithetic to *γιννώσκων*, not exegetical.

In 989 D, *κατὰ τρόπον δὲ μὴ δρῶ τὸ τοιοῦτον* does not mean "fail in some way to do accordingly. *δρῶ τὸ τοιοῦτον* is an idiomatic formula to avoid repetition of *διδάσκει*. *ἐμὲ λέγειν τὴν τοιαύτην*, etc., is not "I agree that, etc." but "it is for me to describe, etc."

In 991 D, *εἰ δὲ μή, θεὸν ἄμεινον αἰεὶ καλεῖν* is not "he had better always call it god," but "it is better to invoke god" (to help us).

In 992 B, *ἐκ πολλῶν ἕνα γεγονότα* of course does not mean "having been singled out as fit to receive a rare blessing reserved for a chosen few." Cf. the same words in Rep. 443 E.

There are few such slips in the other dialogues. In *Charmides* 156 A the idiomatic force of *εἰ μὴ ἀδικῶ γε* is missed by "Unless I misjudge."

In *Minos* 314 E *οὕτως ἀπλῶς* is perhaps "without qualification" rather than "in that simple fashion."

In *Alc. i.* 121 C, *τοσοῦτον ὑπερβάλλει* is not "so far surpasses us."

In 122 C, *εὐχέρειαν* is not facility as was explained in *Classical Philology* (Vol. XII, p. 308).

In *Alc. ii.* 147 E, *πάλιν αὖ μοι δοκεῖ* is not "I repeat that I think so." Cf. the note on αὖ in the July number of this *Journal*.

In Hipparchus 230 A, οὐτι πᾶν γε μοι ἀνάθου, cannot possibly mean, either by the Greek or by the context, "Nothing of all this do I bid you revoke for me." We must put a full stop after γε, and render, "No, not in every case. Let me take back that statement."

PAUL SHOREY

Les Formules et la metrique d'Homère. By MILMAN PARRY.

L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère. By MILMAN PARRY.

Paris: Société d'éditions *Les Belles Lettres*, 1928.

The dissertation is an excellent and apparently exhaustive study of its subject, the usefulness of which to Homeric students will not depend on their agreement with all of the literary generalizations about the qualities that distinguish Homeric from modern poetry which the author or his readers may deduce from its collection. Dr. Parry, indeed, avoids or evades dogmatic pronouncements on the Homeric question, though he personally seems to mean by "Homer" the great poet or poets who came at the end and cast the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* essentially into the form in which we read them. His object is to show more conclusively and in greater detail what of course was known before, that the Homeric epithet (like much else in Homer) was the conventionalized outcome of a long evolution or epic tradition. He makes a strong case for his contention that "Homer" inherited stock epithets for every person, thing, situation, case, or place in the verse; and that in the composition of his verses little remained for the poet to do except to remember the epithet that the tradition designated as most convenient for the noun. There was little room for originality or invention. A careless reader might even get the impression that the coinage of the Homeric epithets was the work of such a multitude of predecessors that nobody need be credited with much, if any, invention. The epic tradition and the language of its expression just grew.

Dr. Parry does not really intend this or any of the other exaggerations of his thesis which a captious critic might attribute to him. The appearance of them merely results from his preoccupation with his special theme and the tables of tags and stock epithets which he has assembled.

One of the arguments by which he supports his thesis is a comparison with Virgil and Apollonius of Rhodes, which shows, as he would put it, that a personal and individual poetry is unable to invent anything comparable to the number of stock and metrically adapted epithets with which tradition supplied Homer. I am inclined to think that he would have found a closer approximation to Homer, if not always in epithets, in tags and formulas and half-verses if he had extended these comparisons to the Greek drama and to the style of Pope in relation to Dryden, Milton, and Shakespeare and of Pope's successors to Pope.

However that may be, his preoccupation with the epithet leads to an apparent neglect of Homer's presumably original art, which is doubtless not

designed. One of the most striking features of Homer's art is his ability to carry a long periodic sentence with just rhetorical emphasis at every point through all the Miltonic windings and harmonies of his meter. I doubt if any tradition taught him that, or if we have any evidence that his hypothetical predecessors could do it any more than could the authors of any other primitive epic which could be named. But that opens too large a field for this notice. One undesigned coincidence of Dr. Parry's work with my paper on the logic of the Homeric simile (*Class. Phil.*, XVII, 240 ff.) interests me. Dr. Parry holds that the conventional Homeric epithet is rarely adapted to the mood, the circumstance, the situation. I argued against Wilamowitz that the conventional Homeric simile rarely, if ever, expresses Stimmung or the kind of feeling that Ruskin nicknamed the "pathetic fallacy." The coincidence is interesting, though the main reason for my conclusion was not that the Homeric simile was drawn from a traditional stock, but that the strict logic of its confinement to a single point of resemblance generally precluded this emotional adaptation.

I have not done justice to Dr. Parry's thoughtful studies but have perhaps said enough to recommend them to students of Homer.

PAUL SHOREY

Cycles of Taste. By FRANK P. CHAMBERS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

One must begin by discounting a little the claims made for this booklet by the author and publisher. There is nothing new in the commonplace that early art criticism, including that of the Greeks, dwells naïvely on the resemblance of the work of art to life. Not to speak of the exhaustive collections of Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* the American student need look no farther than Gildersleeve's note on Pindar *Olympian* vii. 52. There is also nothing new in the thought embodied in the title that there are fashions and cycles in taste as in other things. And the emphasis laid throughout the book on the thought that there has always been a "moral resistance" to art is generalized from Plato's banishment of the poets and is obviously determined by recent American controversy.

The upshot of it all, the author's own intention and conclusion is too obscurely stated for me to be sure of his meaning. I do not know whether he does or does not intend to confront us with the problem that Ruskin proposed in his contrast between Scotland and India, their moral life and their art. Does he mean to say that the history of the art of the ancients as he interprets it is peculiarly instructive because the contrast between what they did and what they thought and said about art brings home to us the eternal question? May the puritan after all be right and would it be better for the soul's health to do without that emotional stimulus? Or are the hints of that suggestion that I find ironically intended?

It remains to say that the book is a readable sketch of the history of

ancient art criticism, and the notes to the chapters are a useful though not as the author seems to think an unexampled collection of references to the chief texts. Criticism of detail would take us too far. It is no novelty that he does not quite understand what Plato meant by imitation. And his statement that "Plato's long disquisitions on beauty in the *Gorgias*, *Philebus*, *Phaedrus* and *Republic* . . . bear no allusion to aesthetic beauty" is too obviously mistaken to need refutation here. The beautiful but playful and ambiguous sentence of *Republic* 403C quoted in support of this statement is completely misunderstood. Mr. Chambers renders it "the affairs of the Muses ought somehow to conclude in the love of the beautiful," understanding the love of the beautiful in an entirely non-aesthetic sense. There is of course a suggestion of that. But the English reader will be misled. Plato's real meaning is that the consummation of culture is the love of the beautiful. Mr. Chambers regards it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of Plato's theory of imitation that he "goes so far as to use the simile of the mirror in referring to poetry, sculpture and painting." He should then include Shakespeare and Emerson in his condemnation. He quotes, as so many have done, the sentence in Aristophanes' *Frogs* that describes the poet as the (moral) teacher, but neglects to tell his readers that the *Frogs* is not only the earliest, but still in many respects the wittiest, the most penetrating, the most subtle piece of literary criticism in the world. Cicero's affectation of disdain for the fine arts in his prosecution of Verres no more proves his "moral resistance" to art than his ridicule of stoicism in his *Pro Murena* proves a contempt for philosophy. Any clever lawyer would talk to a jury in that fashion today. Polycrates of Samos is not an example of "the collecto-mania of the Hellenistic age" as page 26 seems to imply.

But I do not mean to cavil on details.

PAUL SHOREY

Homer, Dichtung und Sage. Dritter Band. Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege. By ERICH BETHE. Teubner, 1927. Pp. vi+194. 11 Marks.

This book contains a restatement and an amplification of the views so long associated with the name of the author.

Professor Bethe denies unhesitatingly any connection between Homeric poetry and the sixth city of Troy. He is certain that Agamemnon had nothing to do with Mycenae and that Mycenae too was unknown to the older poets of the *Iliad*. He likewise denies any real existence to Atreus and thinks it impossible to relate in any way the recently translated Hittite material with Priam, Atreus, Troy, or Argos.

He argues that the Troad was absolutely unknown to the Greeks until about the seventh century, and that the poets of the "Wrath" did not know the name of any city near the Scamander. The older poets of the *Iliad* knew only the name Troia, an adjective and not a noun, meaning a city of the Trojans. The name Ilium is very late and is due to Iles, the father of the

lesser Ajax, who appears in Homer as Oileus. This is only another way of writing ὁ Ἴλεις. It was thus a Greek and not a barbarian who gave a name to that hitherto-nameless city, which then became known as ἡ Ἴλου πόλις.

The name must thus be later than Greek conflicts along the Dardanelles, which cannot be older than the seventh century. Greece had no real interest in that region until the efforts of the Athenians to get a footing there. The diffused knowledge of the Troad shown in the present and late *Iliad* is due to the interest in Troy created by Athenian efforts to establish a base at Sigeum.

Anchises, Aeneas, Deiphobus, Hector, Paris, even Troy itself, were all of Greek origin, and only in late times were torn from their homes and placed on a foreign soil. Even the Palladium had never been across the Aegean. "The Palladium was native to Argos, here was its place of honor, but to make it especially famous the story was invented that it had been carried from Ilium by Diomedes" (p. 85).

Menelaus, Agamemnon, Diomedes, Odysseus, and Helen are late intruders into the story of the *Iliad*, which cannot be older than 600, while the *Odyssey* is considerably later.

The *Iliad* is simply a conglomerate of many poems composed in many parts of Greece, then boldly forced into a foreign plot and transferred to the Troad.

Achilles was the leader of the Aeolic forces who fought the Thebans whose champion was Hector. The story of the ninth book of the *Iliad*, "The Embassy," is a Lacedaemonian poem wrested from its true place and forced into an alien plot. The night adventures of the tenth book, "The Doloneia," is simply the account of the capture of Ismarus, the city of the Cicones, by Odysseus, and Rhesus is the Thracian chief who came to that city's rescue. It was this exploit at Ismarus which gave Odysseus the title "city-sacker."

The author is at his best when he explains how it came about that all parts of Greece gave up their own heroic legends and delivered them to Asiatic Troy, a region with which neither the Greeks nor Greek traditions had ever had the slightest connection. I slightly condense page 161:

How did it happen that the stories of the Trojan war were removed to the ruins on the hill of Hissarlik, which had no connection with them and which could not have been seen by them until 700? The Trojan myths are the result of battles fought by the Aeolians with a Greek tribe called the Trojans; these battles were fought in Greece with Achilles and Hector as opposing leaders. The Aeolians carried the memories of these heroic deeds with them across the sea and recognized in Achilles their own champion and in his exploits their own history. Finally when they had become established at Lesbos they naturally transferred these exploits to the neighboring mainland, and thus they based their claim to the land they coveted by localizing in it the victory of their own Achilles. By good luck the land they sought had the name of Troy which was also the name of the land defended in Greece by Hector.

It was thus the ambitions of the Aeolians to seize a Troy to which they had no right that transferred the deeds of the *Iliad* from Greece to the Troad. The Athenians at that very time were laying a claim to Sigeum and the shores of the Dardanelles; why did they fall in with the Aeolian imposture? Why did all Greece give up its cherished traditions, just to help out rivals in their fraud? Why did Athens yield in such humility that not a single man of that grasping city ever betrayed or protested the hoax which robbed it both of territory and traditions?

Compare Herodotus v. 94: "The Mytilenaeans and the Athenians fought long for the Troad, the former claiming the land as their own, while the Athenians refused to admit their claim, showing by reasoning that the Aeolians had no more right to the Troad than the Athenians had, or any others of the Greeks who had helped Menelaus recover Helen." This completely takes the ground from beneath the assumption that the *Iliad* is a late Athenian compilation made in the interest of the Aeolians.

The whole structure of this book rests on the two assumptions: first, that Hector was a Theban hero; second, that the *Iliad* is later than the Athenian occupation of Sigeum.

He answers the arguments which I had advanced, that Hesiod and Pindar knew nothing of the Theban origin of Hector, with these words (p. 80): "für beide war Homer massgebend, zumal Pindar meist für nicht-thebaner dichtete." How could Homer be decisive for Hesiod, when Bethe himself puts Hesiod long before the *Iliad*? Bethe argues that the older parts of the *Iliad* know nothing of Helen at Troy and that all such references are as late as 600, but Hesiod in *Works and Days* 165 refers to those heroes who went over the sea to Troy in order to bring back the fair-haired Helen. These verses are from the undoubted poem of Hesiod and prove that long before his assumed date Helen and Troy were associated.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from the fact that Pindar wrote for others than for Thebans? Thebes had gone through great humiliation, and Pindar was anxious to recall her glories to the hostile nations of Greece. Why does he not claim some honor for his native city from the fact that she had given birth to the honored Hector? There can be but one reason for this silence on the part of the poet, and that is the simple one, he knew of no such traditions. This disposes of Hector as a Theban hero, the major premise of the book.

The minor premise is that the *Iliad* is later than 600. How did it happen that a poem of such late birth, composed by so many men with material taken from so many lands, should immediately have had sufficient influence to direct the thought of Hesiod and Pindar and of all early Greece?

The date given by Herodotus, that is, four hundred years before his own day, fits perfectly into the dominating position which that poet had in Greece. Many Homers or a late Homer cannot explain the Homeric influence upon the life and thought of Greece.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere bibliographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

Der französisch-mittelgriechische Ritterroman Imberios und Margarona.

By NIKOS A. BEES. Berlin: Wilmersdorf, 1924.

As a pendant to the review on page 292 may be noted here the study of Dr. Bees (Béys), editor of *Texte und Forschungen z. Byz.-neugriech. Philologie*, devoted to the early modern Greek versions of the old French romance of "the fair Magalona and Peter, son of the Count of Provence," which in Greek bears the title of *Imberios und Margarona*. The story which has maintained itself down to the present time as a widely read popular novel in French, Italian, and German, as well as in modern Greek, has had remarkable influence not only on modern Greek popular literature and story, but also upon the literature of Western Europe. Its influence upon Manzoni and Cervantes has been noted, and it enjoys a certain classical position in German in the version of Tieck, *Wundersame Liebesgeschichte der schönen Magelone und des Grafen Peter aus der Provence*. It is from this version that the lyrics of Brahms, *Romanzen aus Tiecks Magelone*, are drawn, which form another link in the transmission of the story to an indefinite future. The plot is in its main outlines the conventional one, which has received its most classical form in "i Promessi Sposi" of two lovers, either betrothed or newly married, who through fate and the villainy of others are separated, and after passing through endless trials and temptations with untarnished purity are finally united. It is a formulation which fits the Greek romances with essential accuracy, and the reading of Dr. Bees's account of the transformations and ramifications of this modern story is calculated to inspire doubt about the possibility of arriving at anything like a final solution of the sources of the Greek romances such as is proposed by Kerényi.

G. L. H.

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium. Post AEMILIUM BAEHRENS iterum edidit WILLY MOREL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.

In this revision of Baehrens' well-known book the editor has omitted Ennius and Lucilius because these authors have been so well edited in separate editions by Vahlen and Marx. Hence Morel's edition contains only 190+vi pages, as against the 427 pages (of which 28 are taken up by the Introduction) in Baehrens. The fragments of the drama had already been omitted by Baehrens as being taken care of by Ribbeck. Varro's *Menippeans* are omitted because they are important enough to deserve a separate edition.

Morel does not hesitate to criticize vigorously Baehrens' work. He omits some fifty quotations found in Baehrens. On pages 187-88 he justifies the omissions by indicating that some of the fragments are dramatic, others are lines from complete poems still extant (Lucan, Ausonius, Claudian, and even Virgil!), etc. In many cases Baehrens tried to restore verse out of prose paraphrases. This Morel does not do; e.g., Baehrens has eleven lines from the *Tabula Triumphatoria* of Aemilius, Morel gives but one. On the other hand, Morel has made a few additions. Notable changes are made in the order of fragments within a work, e.g., in Livius Andronicus, Baehrens' fragment 34 becomes 30, 42 is called spurious, etc. Most important is the rejection of the scores of emendations introduced by Baehrens. For example, Baehrens prints a line of Appius Claudius thus: "ne quid fraudis pariat, ferocia stuprique." In Morel it reads: "ne quid fraudis stuprique ferocia pariat." A familiar passage in Naevius now reads "immolabat auream" instead of "in auream molabat." Another passage now reads "manusque susum . . . Amulius divis<que> gratulabatur" instead of "hisque susum . . . ambas laetus Amulius, gratulabat divis." In twenty-one fragments of Calvus there are four differences; in ten of Maecenas there are five differences.

In the earlier part Morel depends largely on Leo. Throughout he has carefully sifted the recent literature. All in all he has done an excellent piece of work which entirely supplants that of Baehrens. We may be thankful that one more of Baehrens' careless *opera* has been relegated to the limbo of forgotten things.

B. L. ULLMAN

Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Edidit E. HOHL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927. 2 vols.

This long-awaited edition is most welcome as superseding that of Peter in the same series. Hohl's previously published work on the manuscripts made unnecessary a long introduction and allows the reader to guess the nature of his text. Peter had given preference to the Bamberg manuscript, which has long since been proved to be a copy of P (Palatinus). In fact, most, if not all, of the existing manuscripts are descended from P. The Preface makes no mention of Miss Ballou, who was to have collaborated in this edition, but who disagreed with Hohl by maintaining that the group of manuscripts designated as Σ are not independent of P (see *Classical Philology*, XI, 357).

Hohl has made his edition as faithful a reproduction of P as possible. Whenever he departs from it in the slightest degree, he indicates the change by typographical means. He even goes so far as to print in italics within angular brackets the letter *a* of the diphthong *ae*, which the manuscript regularly gives as *e*. This is going to absurd lengths and shows a lack of understanding of palaeographical matters. Not even an apparatus should ordinarily make report on such things. Similar scrupulousness is shown by Hohl

in other matters of spelling. Even when P obviously repeats a word or phrase by mistake (e.g., *Opil. Macr.* 8. 4 *et Antoninus et Antoninus*), Hohl carefully prints it so in the text, putting one in square brackets. All this makes for difficult reading. One certainly has to look at least twice to understand the meaning of "laccessi[t]v[s]lra<n>t" (*Alex. Sev.* 28. 7). Hohl has wisely abandoned Peter's method of indicating supposedly later insertions by typographical devices.

B. L. ULLMAN

Les Symboles Graphiques dans les Éditions Critiques de Textes. Projet d'unification. By JOSEPH SIEMIENSKI. Warsaw: Fondation J. Mianowski, 1927. Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie.

This pamphlet is a plea for the general adoption of a system of critical signs in editions. It differs from previous suggestions in its greater elaborateness and in presenting a detailed classification of cases requiring symbols. The suggestions are summarized in two tables—one giving a complete system, with thirty-six symbols; the other a simplified system, with seventeen symbols. The former, with its variously broken brackets and parentheses, is quite impossible; and even the simpler system is too elaborate and has such objectionable features as broken, angular brackets. But the idea of establishing some sort of uniformity is a good one and might well be taken up by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Union Académique Internationale.

B. L. ULLMAN

C. Iulius Caesar Commentarii, Vol. III: *Commentarii Belli Alexandrini, Belli Africi, Belli Hispaniensis, Fragmenta*. Edidit A. KLOTZ. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.

This edition completes Klotz's revision of the *Teubner Caesar* and takes the place of that by Kübler. It cannot be said that its manuscript foundation is greatly improved. One manuscript is cited which Kübler did not know (L), but no complete collation was available to Klotz. Nor were the other manuscripts re-examined for the new edition. The text tradition is the same as that for the *Civil War*. The apparatus is at the bottom of the page, a much more convenient arrangement than in Kübler, in which it is placed at the beginning.

The laws and decrees of Caesar, included by Kübler among the fragments, are omitted by Klotz because they have nothing to do with Caesar as an author. The position is a logical one, but the inclusion of this material would have been useful. Probably economy was more responsible for the omission than logic. The fragments of the letters are rearranged in three *corpora*, in accordance with the information given by Suetonius.

B. L. ULLMAN

Sparta. By F. BÖLTE, V. EHRENBURG, L. ZIEHEN, G. LIPPOLD. Sonderabdruck aus Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

That marvelous creation of collective and co-operative German scholarship, the new Pauly-Wissowa, has now reached the letter "S." The approaching completion of this great undertaking suggests more comment than space and relevancy permit here. No isolated scholar and small freshwater college need be wholly excluded from vitalizing contact with modern scholarship if they can find the money to purchase this single work. To turn its pages and realize the small part of this colossal repertorium of knowledge that you or your colleagues can master or convey to your pupils is to sentimentalize again on the heartening or disheartening disproportion between classical philology as the *Erkenntnis des Erkannten* and the insignificant *Erkenntnisse* of the most industrious individual philologist.¹ The cure for such profitless introversion is to accept with gratitude this great gift of German scholarship as a tool to be used, not a compendium to be memorized.

These reflections are called forth by a preprint of the article *Sparta* which this note acknowledges, while the editor seeks a reviewer who will do it justice. Yet we can hardly expect from any single reviewer a critical examination of 366 columns packed with facts by such specialists as F. Bölte, who treats of the name, the *Ethnika* and the *Ktetika*, V. Ehrenberg who gives an "Abriss" of Spartan history in 179 columns, L. Ziehen who discusses Spartan cults, G. Lippold who concludes this indispensable monograph with "*Sparta als Kunststadt*."

PAUL SHOREY

Psychology Ancient and Modern: By GEORGE SIDNEY BRETT. "Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series." New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928. Pp. xiii+164.

Professor Brett's excellent history of psychology designated him for the authorship of this volume. He has wisely chosen to emphasize only the best things in the psychology of the ancients, and to dwell rather on the anticipation of modern ideas by Plato and Aristotle than on the apparent survivals of primitive and naïve thought. He has done his work well and made a readable book which will rarely, if ever, mislead the ordinary reader. It is not his fault that the limitations imposed by the plan of the series make it impossible for him to offer much that will be new and interesting to scholars. He is, or affects to be, more surprised than I am that Plato and Aristotle could go so far in psychology without even knowing of the existence of the nerves. I re-

¹ Cf. "Philology and Classical Philology" in the first volume of the *Classical Journal*.

serve my surprise for the time when someone will deign to mention a single important, new, strictly psychological truth which has been discovered by approaching the study of mind by way of the nervous system. His statement that Plato thinks that "there is more hope for the quick-witted scoundrel than for apathetic, self-complacent mediocrity" may be plausibly supported by the passage of the *Republic* which presumably suggested it (519 B). But it is tinged with modernist propaganda in the expression. And the impression that it will leave in the mind of the modern reader is in contradiction with Plato's deepest moral convictions as expressed in notable passages of the *Theaetetus* and *Laws*. "We must not," says the *Theaetetus*, "call bad men clever though wicked, for they exult in that reproach." "We must taunt them with ignorance," says the *Laws* (689 C), "though they may be quick at reckoning and masters of all the subtleties and celerities of the soul. And men of the opposite type we must salute as wise, even though they cannot read or swim."

PAUL SHOREY

Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina. By A. B. DRACHMANN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927, 12 M.

The scholia on Pindar are not only of interest for lexicography, mythology, and the pseudo-science of the "new" metrik, they are still useful for the teacher of Pindar, who will welcome the completion after nearly twenty years of Drachmann's convenient Teubner text. An epimetrum adds Eustathius' introduction with his contorted but detailed analysis of Pindar's style and a few other slight prefaces. Ninety pages of indexes subdivided under twenty-one heads make the miscellaneous information of the three volumes readily accessible and henceforth indispensable to the student of Pindar.

Detailed criticism is out of the question here. But I have used the first two volumes in teaching and have read enough in this to see that the work is well done. On page 293 should not *μη ἀκριβῆ* *Αἰολίδα* be *μη ἀκριβῆ* in spite of *ἀκριπτον* on the next page?

PAUL SHOREY

Cicero, The Letters to His Friends, with an English Translation. Vol. I: Books i-vi. By W. GLYNN WILLIAMS, M.A. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927.

The translator handicapped himself by adopting Nobbe's edition (1849); the text still contains such spellings as *conditio*, *Piraeum*, *coenae*, *poenitebit*, *concionibus*, *commendatitias*, and *quum* (pp. 114, 300, 302, 322, 334, 338, and 418, respectively). Some slips are conspicuous: "buried" for "burned" (p. xxiii) and "succeeded" for "preceded" (p. 132); "stomach" should be "throat" on page 303. There is no little chaos in the treatment of proper names:

"M. Crassus's sister Porcia" (p. xxiii), "Volcatius" for "Volcaci" (p. 7), "Petronius" for "Petreius" (p. 148), "Ariobarzanus" for "Ariobarzanes" (p. 157), and "Clodio" for "Claudio" (p. 210). C. Cato and M. Cato are confused in the Index. *Praenomina* are found expanded and unexpanded on the same pages (pp. 67, 265, and *passim*). The only misprints noted are *preator* (p. 279) and *literis* (p. 298).

The translation itself has not a few merits, and most of its faults could have been corrected by the editors. Italics are too frequent, and such quaint words as "ah," "aye," "nay," "wont," "behoved," and "bethink," though used in moderation, ought to be banned altogether. The volume will serve the needs of laymen but students ought to look for something more thorough-going, exact, and reliable.

N. W. DE WITT

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

L'Évolution de L'Humanité: Le Monde Romain. By VICTOR CHAPOT.
Paris: La Renaissance du Livre, 1927.

After a glance at the expansion of Roman power under the Republic the author describes the organization of the imperial system under the heads of "Defence," "Finances," "Municipia," and "Provinces." The main part of the work is a treatment of the provinces one by one, their history, administration, and social and political life. The results of a vast number of researches are faithfully compiled. The Bibliography is ample and up to date, though Frank's *Economic History of Rome* is not cited, a serious omission. There are a dozen unattractive maps and two plates of imperial coins. Altogether a very useful volume of reference but not light reading.

N. W. DE WITT

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Our Hellenic Heritage. By H. R. JAMES. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Two volumes in one. Pp. xv+408, xv+540.

"The aim of this book is to bring together just so much of the elements of Greek legend and history as should be the possession of every one born into the civilization we call European." With this statement the author, formerly principal of Presidency College, Calcutta, both inclines a reviewer to a friendly approach and indicates that the book's appeal will be rather to the general reader and younger student than to the classical scholar. Meeting Mr. James on this ground, I have no hesitation in saying that he has written a useful and creditable book and has come as near to achieving his aim as is possible when an author limits himself practically to Athens and brings his chapters on the history side only to the close of the Peloponnesian War. He insists frequently on the desirability of turning to the original Greek masterpieces;

he brightens his papers with apposite quotations from modern poets; he links the present and the past instructively without being labored or forced in his parallels; he even points out the charm of approaching Athens on foot from Corinth.

The latter half of the book deals with "Athens, Her Splendour and Her Fall." Here we have chapters on political history followed by the drama, architecture and sculpture, Socrates, and so forth. These are written clearly and attractively with no attempt at innovation, erudition, or mere cleverness. There is a helpful closing chapter on travel and discovery. Then we have notes on books, an outline of dates, and a usable Index. There are thirty-six illustrations, twenty-nine maps and plans. The material book, apart from an unwelcome fatness, is admirable.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Hellas the Forerunner. By H. W. HOUSEHOLD. Vol. I, *Athens in Her Glory*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. Pp. ix+218.

This is a brightly written little volume carrying out the spirit of the suggestive title. Just what demand there is for this sort of popularization I do not know, but I trust this likeable book will find the readers for whom it is intended. It would be absolutely beside the point to raise minor questions of accuracy or similar points when the author has stated his case so clearly and has recognized so frankly the necessary limitations of his volume. He is modestly ready to be content "if what has been included provokes thought and a wish to read more widely." He quotes freely from Greek sources and refers frequently to "modern experience and modern poetry." Obviously the book is not for readers of *Classical Philology*, but there is a freshness about it that made it readable for a reviewer who was once fortunate enough to know a tiny bit about Greek history and literature.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

